175th Legislative Day

11/2/2007

Speaker Hannig: "The hour of 9:00 having arrived, the House will be in order. Members will be in their seats. Members and guests are asked to refrain from starting their laptops, turn off all cell phones, and pagers, and rise for invocation and the Pledge of Allegiance. We shall be led in prayer today by Reverend Morrison Wleh, Superintendent for the United Methodist Church in Liberia. He is currently visiting United Methodist Churches in East Central Illinois, interpreting the work of the church in the Nana Kru District where he serves. Reverend Wleh is a guest of Representative Brady."

Reverend Wleh: "Before the prayer and I bring you greetings from Liberia, from your brothers and sisters. Let us now bow in prayer. As the scripture says, let us... let everyone be subject to the governing authorities. For there is no authority except that which God has established, authority that exists have been established by God. Consequently, whoever rebels against the authority is rebelling against what God has instituted and those who do so would be bringing judgment on themself. And so, our God and our Heavenly Father, we thank You for giving us new life today and we also thank You for these men and women whom You have chosen to lead Your constituency in the State of Illinois. Lord, the one whom You call is the one whom You equipped. And so, the need for direction, the need for guidance, and the need of Your wisdom, because Solomon asked for wisdom, and they are no exception. But give them the insight to be people of radical hospitality, to want others in their constituencies and the wider community. As Representatives

175th Legislative Day

11/2/2007

there are lots of demands and quick result expected from them by their people whom they lead. And it requires patience, heart, and flexibility and so, Lord, we pray that You'd give them these human qualities as a mark of good leadership. Again, we thank You. These are Your people. Lead them to make wise decisions, not only for Illinois or not only for the United States, but for the wider world so that day when turn shall come, they will be blessed. And we, on the other side of the continent, will also be blessed from their wisdom. Lead us now, in the name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit. Amen. Amen."

- Hannig: "Representative Will Davis, will you lead us in the Pledge."
- Davis, W. et al: "I pledge allegiance to the flag of the United States of America and to the republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all."
- Hannig: "Roll Call for Attendance. Representative Currie.

 Representative Currie."
- Currie: "Thank you, Speaker. And let the record reflect that Representative Scully is excused today."
- Hannig: "And Representative Bost."
- Bost: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Let the record reflect that Representative Hassert, Lindner, Pihos, and Schock are all excused on the Republican side of the aisle today."
- Hannig: "Mr. Clerk, take the record. There are 113 Members answering the Roll Call, a quorum is present. Mr. Clerk, read the Committee Reports."

175th Legislative Day

11/2/2007

Clerk Mahoney: "Representative Barbara Flynn Currie, Chairperson from the Committee on Rules, to which the following legislative measures and/or Joint Action Motion were referred, action taken on November 02, 2007, reported the same back with the following recommendation/s: 'approved for floor consideration' is Amendment #3 to Senate Bill 783."

Hannig: "Representative Bost, for what reason do you rise?"

Bost: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. An inquiry of the Chair."

Hannig: "State your inquiry."

Bost: "I'm noticing on the Calendar that this is the 175th Legislative Day. I was wondering if maybe... and I know that's a record, but I was kind of wondering, could we go back and kind of survey the days and find out which days were kind of like yesterday where we really didn't do a whole lot and we're in... and if we could subtract those off and see if we can get it back down to where it should be or if we're just going to go ahead and you know, keep down this path that we are just coming in for no apparent reason because people in high places around here can't make decisions and get things together? We're just going to keep following this path?"

Hannig: "I think we'll come in we are..."

Bost: "Well, do you think we'll get to 200 of this year? Two hundred (200) is a good number, I guess."

Hannig: "Probably won't get past 365, it's too late for that."

Bost: "Well, 365... that... we won't get there."

Hannig: "So, we're going to stand at ease for a moment here in the regular Session. We're going to go to the Fifteenth

175th Legislative Day

11/2/2007

Special Session. Now, we're back into the regular Session. On page 12 of the Calendar, we have a number of concurrences we're going to address. And the first one is House Bill 1284. And Representative Coulson, you're recognized on the Motion to Concur."

- Coulson: "Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I move to Concur with House Bill... Senate Amendments in House Bill 1284. There essentially four (4) different extensions of sunsets and with some administrative language changes. And I can answer any questions."
- Speaker Hannig: "You heard the Lady's Motion. Is there any discussion? Then the question is, 'Shall the House concur in the Senate Amendments?' And shall this... excuse me, Representative Black."

Black: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?" Speaker Hannig: "Indicates she'll yield."

- Black: "Representative, I just want to make sure that I'm not making a mistake. I've had dozens of e-mails, particularity from physician's assistants, and since we're seem to be combining so many professions into one (1) Bill, the physicians' assistants sunset is in this Bill and is renewed, correct?"
- Coulson: "Yes. The physician assistants, the Marriage and Family Therapy Licensing Act, the Nursing Home Administrators' License Disciplinary Act, and the Home Medical Equipment and Services Act would all be extended. If we do not do it today, they will sunset on January 1, 2008."

175th Legislative Day

11/2/2007

Black: "Will they still have time to get their licenses back?

I had a question this morning from one (1), wondering if
the department was going to be able to get all of the
renewals out and their licenses out prior to January 1,
because many of them, if they don't have the license in
their physical possession, cannot work."

Coulson: "Correct. And as far as I know that is the intent of the department."

Black: "Okay. All right. Thank you very much."

Speaker Hannig: "Is there any further discussion? Then the question is, 'Shall the House concur in the Senate Amendment and shall this Bill pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. The voting is open. This requires 71 votes. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 113 voting 'yes' and 0 voting 'no'. And the House does concur on Senate Amendment #1. And this Bill, having received a Three-fifths Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On the Order of Concurrence is House Bill 1540. Representative Pritchard, you're recognized on the Motion to Concur. 1514, Mr. Clerk."

Pritchard: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This Bill deals with an extension of the TIF district in the City of DeKalb. This Bill really is allowing the city to do what was intended with the TIF Bill initially. The city has had a long developed program of trying to renew the downtown area. And by extending their TIF district another 12 years, they'll be able to fund this program and keep the momentum

175th Legislative Day

11/2/2007

going to renew the downtown area. We have all of the requisite support letters from other local units of government. I ask for your concurrence in this Senate Amendment."

Speaker Hannig: "The Gentleman moves that the House concur in the Senate Amendment. Is there any discussion? question is, 'Shall the House concur in the Amendment #1 and shall this Bill pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. The voting is open. This requires 60 votes. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Saviano, do you wish to be recorded? Mr. Clerk, take the record. this question, there are 110 voting 'yes' and 3 voting 'no'. And the House does concur in the Senate Amendment. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Chapa LaVia, you're recognized on a Motion to Concur on House Bill 3393."

Chapa LaVia: "Thank you, Speaker and Members of the House. This Bill... I move that we concur with Senate Amendment #2. There was some contention because of the language that was placed in there. But right now at this time, in place in the State of Illinois, I've seen more domestic violent cases than I've seen in this year, in the last 5 years that I've been down here. And this helps those individuals that are caught in domestic violence for being able to have their legal representation request a grant from the Attorney General's Office, to help them with the cost of the court proceedings for divorce or child custody. I

175th Legislative Day

11/2/2007

implore you to concur with the House Amendment because it's the right thing to do for these victims. I'll take any questions."

Speaker Hannig: "Is there any discussion? The Gentleman from Vermilion, Representative Black."

Black: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Hannig: "She indicates she'll yield."

Black: "Representative, you... in your opening remarks you said concur in the House Amendment. I'm sure you mean..."

Chapa LaVia: "I'm sorry. Senate Amendment."

Black: "Concur in the Senate Amendment. All right."

Chapa LaVia: "Representative Black."

Black: "Let me just ask you a couple of questions. The… what this fee will do is a laudable goal. I'm concerned about two things. Evidently, we cannot get antisweep language in the Bill, correct?"

Chapa LaVia: "That's correct. Without the support of the Senate. And in the past, the Governor, has never taken money out of a Domestic Violence Fund. And we have promises from the Governor's staff. But we know things change quickly down here. But anything helps, Representative Black."

Black: "Well, I wouldn't think this would be a fund that he would want to sweep. But, as you say, things change. I've heard from a few constituents who just simply have a philosophical problem with having to pay five (\$5) dollars more for a marriage license, when they don't anticipate ever having to avail themselves of domestic violence shelters or counseling. It's difficult to answer those

175th Legislative Day

11/2/2007

kinds of questions. My wife and I have been married a very, very long time, more years than you are old. And it was obvious to me that any domestic violence on my part, I wouldn't need counseling, I'd need an embalmer. So, that was never an option that I would consider. And so, one could make this argument, why should I have to pay an extra five (\$5) dollars..."

Chapa LaVia: "Right."

Black: "When I certainly have no intentions or belief that I will ever avail myself of these services."

Chapa LaVia: "Right. Last time we debated this you asked me what percentage of these women are spouses that find themselves in domestic violence were married prior to this. And it's 50 percent of those individuals. I know that it's not a lot of comfort that you can give those individuals that say, 'Why are we paying five (\$5) dollars to put into this fund?' But when you look at the larger picture of things, if we don't help them on the front end, it becomes our problem in a larger way as far as funding these shelters, funding these children through DHS and the Family Services. They become a lot of money and strain on the system if we're not able to help them Ounce of Prevention on the front end. And thank God, we have people that are married as long as you have been, Sir. And I've been married fifteen (15) years and I'm proud of that. But a lot of people don't find themselves in the relationships that we would like them to have. So, I understand your concern, and your constituents' concern, but this is one of the issues where I feel strongly about it. My family, we

175th Legislative Day

11/2/2007

- sit on boards for domestic violence homes. We do a lot of not-for-profit work and this is just a little to help a lot."
- Black: "I appreciate that. Let me go back to the… I think the concern, you and I share. Do you have any idea how much this five (\$5) dollar increase will amount to per year. I mean, are we talking a few million, several million?"
- Chapa LaVia: "No. It's not even that. It's... I think the guesstimate, I'm going to take a stab at it, I don't have any of my paperwork because they kind of cleared our desks out. I want to say around six hundred thousand (\$600,000)."

Black: "All right."

- Chapa LaVia: "And it would be secured by Lisa Madigan's office and they would have to fill out a grant request and all the paperwork would have to be verified through her office. So, she would dictate how the money would be sent out."
- Black: "All right. So, it would not, in all likelihood it would not accumulate seven (7,000,000), eight (8,000,000), ten (10,000,000) million dollars?"

Chapa LaVia: "No, no, Sir."

- Black: "Do you have any assurances from the Attorney General that she would not let this fund accumulate? You know obviously the need is there, unfortunately. My fear is once you get into a multimillion dollar fund, it becomes much more attractive for an administrative sweep."
- Chapa LaVia: "Right. Well, with the cooperation of the domestic violence organizations throughout the state and the main one that is... located here in Springfield, we are

175th Legislative Day

11/2/2007

going to be doing a massive campaign as far as communica... communication to each one of those shelters to make sure they can obtain that money. But in the future, Representative Black, if you'd like me to put some language in and amend this next year or the year after to include that information about it can't exceed a certain amount. If it does then the money needs to go into another program."

Black: "Okay."

Chapa LaVia: "I have no problem with doing that. I just know that the need is immediate now and I know I've spoken to other Representatives in different districts and we have to throw our hands up because these women, and usually it's women, are taking out loans on their houses, mortgaging off their houses, living back with their family. They can't afford the legal costs that are in the system right now. But I would be more than happy to talk with you and discuss something that would be amenable to you to put in this law."

Black: "Okay."

Chapa LaVia: "So, we can make it so it doesn't exceed a certain amount. If it does, it tips over that scale, say a million (\$1,000,000), then it goes into a different account that can help something else."

Black: "Okay."

Chapa LaVia: "We can work on that together. I'd love to."

Black: "Is there language in the Bill that specifies how a current domestic violence shelter would access this money

175th Legislative Day

11/2/2007

or would it be done under the current procedures, rules, and regulation?"

Chapa LaVia: "Yeah. It'd have to go through the rules and regulations through JCAR."

Black: "Okay. All right. So, everyone then would have a chance for additional funding?"

Chapa LaVia: "Correct, Sir. It wouldn't be..."

Black: "All right. Thank you."

Chapa LaVia: "It wouldn't Chicago specific, downstate, it would be the whole entire state. And once again, I'm a one-hundred percent positive that I can get the same answer from the Illinois Coalition Against Domestic Violence for the state that we would do a phenomenal job at networking and making sure all the women and men that fall into this category will have equal access to the dollars to have proper representation in the courts for them."

Black: "So, there isn't any percentage. So many..."

Chapa LaVia: "No, Sir."

Black: "Percentage of the dollars go one county..."

Chapa LaVia: "No, Sir."

Black: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, to the Bill. I voted against this the last time is came up. And I do have some concerns about people having to pay to provide services that they do not or are not or will not be responsible for creating. However, the Representative has convinced me that there are certain safeguards in this Bill. There is no question, I agree with her, that the need is there. I visit domestic violence shelters in my legislative district at least once a year for their

175th Legislative Day

11/2/2007

observance. And there's always a waiting list, unfortunately, and some of them... some of them have turned out very tragically in my district. So, since I don't have any alternative plan on how to raise money for these domestic violence shelters, that unfortunately are becoming more and more needed and necessary, I intend to support the Lady's Motion to Concur in the Senate Amendments. I wish we had language that would not allow a fund sweep but I understand that we cannot do that at this time. And I would trust the Attorney General to keep a close eye on that. So, I intend to vote 'aye' and I urge my colleagues to do the same."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Mulligan."

Mulligan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Hannig: "She indicates she'll yield."

Mulligan: "Representative, I tried to follow some of the questioning that Representative Black did, but I'd like to go over a few more issues here. And I'm not sure I'm looking, I'm trying to pull up the engrossed part of it. What's actually, what Amendments are actually on this Bill, now?"

Chapa LaVia: "Well, are you talking about the Senate Amendment, Representative, or the original Bill?"

Mulligan: "I want to know what we're voting on. Tell..."

Chapa LaVia: "Because it's just Senate Amendment #2. We concurred, it came out of the House, went over to the Senate, the Senate added on an Amendment that the Governor was able to sweep the dollars. It came back over here. We were at a position as the House of Representatives were

175th Legislative Day

11/2/2007

very angry at what was going on in the State Government, the Governor, what have you. And I think that the point was well-taken. We don't like these programs that we put in, especially with social services, and domestic violence, and things to be swept. And we do this because we know there's need in the different social services throughout the state that can't provide these dollars. happened is, it went over to the Senate and the Senate put an Amendment on there that the Bill then can be swept by the Governor. And that's the rub. And then it came back I asked for a concurrence, even though I didn't really like the fact that they put that language in, but the Senate seems to do that all the time. So, that's what we are right now. I am asking to concur on Senate Amendment #2, that actually has the Governor has the ability to take those dollars out. I've spoken once again, I've spoken to his staff, it's highly unlikely that he would do that. And I spoken to domestic violence advocacy..."

Mulligan: "No, it's not highly unlikely he would do that. I have had on several occasions... it's because the chargeback authority they're telling me expired he may not be able to do it. But on several occasions coming through our committee and through others I've had to threaten, verbally threaten, for them not to sweep a Domestic Violence Fund. So,..."

Chapa LaVia: "Thank you for your support for that..."

Mulligan: "The thing is..."

175th Legislative Day

11/2/2007

- Chapa LaVia: "Representative Mulligan, I know that you work hard in the field."
- Mulligan: "If he can do it... it's hard for people to vote for fee increases. It's even harder to vote for them if you don't think they're going to go where you want them to go. So, are you just putting on an Amendment that says you're creating the fund, but it still can be swept if that's the case? If we give the Governor the authority?"
- Chapa LaVia: "I'm creating a fund that will help domestic violence victims in this state. And I will fight, and I understand what you said, and you fought, too. And we have to fight for these things, Representative. I will fight to make sure that doesn't get done. And if it does..."
- Mulligan: "You're creating a fund that's going to be given out in grants. Who administers..."
- Chapa LaVia: "In grants through the general attorney."
- Mulligan: "So, the Attorney General is going to have access for the money and she's going to be the one that okay's the grants?"
- Chapa LaVia: "Correct. And they will put forth a program on how these legal advocacies can acquire those dollars through that grant."
- Mulligan: "Is there any caveat on the fund or the grant that would say the agency that receives it must spend a certain percentage on actual legal fees as opposed to administering the agency? I'm not into giving grants to people just to spend them."
- Chapa LaVia: "Yeah. The rules aren't completed yet, Representative Mulligan. Once again, I know, you've been a

175th Legislative Day

11/2/2007

- woman of your word when I ask for your help and support on certain things. I would love to... the language as far as how it's going to be allocated hasn't been set in stone yet, because it has to go through the JCAR committee. So, I'd love for you to..."
- Mulligan: "Representative, with all due respect, I agree that you would give your word. The problem is with this kind of thing, you pass the Bill, you move on, until someone complains or someone checks or an auditor does something on it. You don't necessarily have control over that anymore."
- Chapa LaVia: "No. I can almost promise you, Representative, that I will come back in January with some substantial language that kind of locks that in, with your help and Representative Black's help on that."
- Mulligan: "Well, my feeling on this is I'd like to know how much of the grant would go directly to helping women with their legal fees and how much of it would go to administration?"
- Chapa LaVia: "Right. And how much is going to administration.

 I understand."
- Mulligan: "That's a big deal. If someone comes and gets a political grant and gives it to their friend's agency and their friend decides to spend 90 percent on administration and 10 percent on legal fees, the amount of money... we're not accomplishing what you want to accomplish."
- Chapa LaVia: "Right. I understand. We're not doing want we want to do. I understand and I will work with you on that and that's my promise in front of all the Members here. I mean, we could come up with a pretty substantial piece of

175th Legislative Day

11/2/2007

legislation. I want to thank you, for bringing those points up. Thank you."

Speaker Hannig: "Is there any further discussion? Then Representative Chapa LaVia, to close."

Chapa LaVia: "I want to thank my colleagues on the other side of the aisle for a couple of points that I'd like to work on them in this coming up year, but this is a Bill that I think is going to be very substantial in the domestic violence area as far as legal assistance. And I really would implore my colleagues to work with me in the upcoming years to make sure that we start to fund these agencies at the amount they need to be funded. Because once again, the Ounce of Prevention on the front end helps us in the dollars that we have to look for on the backend. And what happens with the women and the children in the state that are succumb to domestic violence. And I would ask for an 'aye' vote. Thank you."

"The question is, 'Shall the House concur in Speaker Hannig: the Senate Amendment #2 and shall this Bill pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. The voting is open. This requires 60 votes. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative... Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 79 voting 'yes' and 34 voting 'no'. And the House does concur in Senate Amendment #2. And this Bill, having received a Majority, is hereby declared Constitutional passed. Representative Feigenholtz, do you wish to make your Motion to Concur on House Bill 2353? Representative Feigenholtz."

175th Legislative Day

11/2/2007

- Feigenholtz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I wish to concur on Amendment #1 to House Bill 2353, which would amend the State Finance Act by adding new language to create an Affordable Housing Capital Fund. I'd be glad to answer any questions."
- Speaker Hannig: "Representative, can we clarify? Did you wish to concur in 1 and 3? Or..."
- Feigenholtz: "One and 3, that's correct."
- Speaker Hannig: "Okay. Okay. So, the Motion is to concur in Senate Amendments 1 and 3. So, on that question, the Gentleman from Winnebago, Representative Winters."
- Winters: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"
- Speaker Hannig: "Indicates she'll yield."
- Winters: "Does this Bill authorize any new GO bonds, general obligation bonds?"
- Feigenholtz: "No, it doesn't. It doesn't appropriate any money for this Capital Fund. It just establishes it."
- Winters: "It doesn't appropriate..."
- Feigenholtz: "It establishes the fund."
- Winters: "Okay. Again, the question was, does it authorized bonds for that fund? There's no appropriation. Do we authorize them to go out for any bonding at all?"
- Feigenholtz: "Well, I mean... IHDA already has authority, I believe, that's given by the Governor's Office or a state agency. But this does not... obviously, we haven't done a Capital Bill, I'm sure you've heard that."
- Winters: "Well, and that's one of the concerns that I have.

 The Capital Bill is probably growing larger... the demands
 for it are growing larger. I know that we have something

175th Legislative Day

11/2/2007

called iSPACE which is looking for one hundred million (\$100,000,000) dollars a year for open space acquisition. The point of this and the Body should be aware of this, that every demand and every interest group that gets its foot in the door, into the Capital plan will dilute the effect of the taxes we're going to be raising, and the funding sources that we raise for highways, for bridges, for school construction, and for government buildings. Those will be diluted by every additional source. And this housing fund, while it may be laudable goal, is a further dilution of the Capital program."

Feigenholtz: "I understand your concern. I think we're all concerned about what is going to make it into a Capitol program, but I believe that... that's all to be negotiated by the Leaders. I know that there is an affordable housing crisis statewide. I'm sure you have some ideas on how to resolve that, that you were just sharing with me a few minutes ago. But I see no harm in establishing this, Representative Winters. I think that the Legislature had an affordable housing committee for 4 years, I believe, to try and address some of these issues. And at this point..."

Winters: "Well, let's let the Body understand that currently we have authority through the housing development to sell bonds for affordable housing projects. Those projects, then through the rents that they get, pay the bonds off. Is that a fair statement of the way we currently do affordable housing through the Housing Development Authority? They currently have, I've been told, that they have currently about two billion dollars (\$2,000,000,000)

175th Legislative Day

11/2/2007

of bonding authority that they can borrow money, but the projects have to be self-sustaining. There has to be some funding source other than GRF, other than General Revenue Fund, to pay those bonds off. Typically, that would come either from local government subsides, from charitable giving, or from rents from the residents of those housing authorities. Now, what you're doing, and just to make everybody clear, is that you're allowing the GRF then to be used for paying off those bonds, rather than the project standing alone."

- Feigenholtz: "Representative Winters, one of the things that I've just learned from staff is that perhaps the two billion dollars (\$2,000,000,000) that you referred to, there still remains some substantial unspent money and that may be one of the reasons, because we need to revisit how this money is paid back, and perhaps change it so that there are better and more lenient opportunities for people who are in need of this assistance."
- Winters: "But, couldn't that be done through our annual appropriation process?' Where we... do we need this Bill to authorize GRF to pay off the bonds of the Housing and Development Authority?"
- Feigenholtz: "I believe that the advocates who have been working on this Bill have been in conversations with developers who are clamoring to do this but need incentives to do it."
- Winters: "And the incentives would be additional, in this case, you're setting up a fund that would have access to the Capital... the Capital Bill that we're all talking about.

175th Legislative Day

11/2/2007

And again, the point that I'm trying to make to the General Assembly, to the House, is that if we allow this to move forward, we're simply opening the door a crack, and I'm afraid that the overwhelming demand for capital in our state will swamp the door, smash it wide open. And that instead of getting a very major impact on highways, on bridges, on school construction, we will dilute our spending into so many areas that people are not going to notice the difference."

Feigenholtz: "And as I answered earlier, Representative Winters, you know all the twists and turns in the road we've been taking on all of these issues that are still unresolved. And honestly, I think that this is a good Bill. It's going to create incentives and, you know, we always appropriate monies for operational parts of budgets, and then we also are hearing from people that they need bricks and mortar needs. I'm not sure that this is going to… how significant of an ask this is and where it's going to land but I think the legislation stands on its merits."

Winters: "Okay. I thank you for your responses again. To the Bill. This is an expansion of our capital needs in the State. Let's all consider very seriously whether we should keep our Capital Bill focused on the hard infrastructure of roads, of bridges, of schools, or whether we should start expanding it to additional areas. Thank you very much."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Lang."

Lang: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen. I rise in strong support of the Lady's Motion. It's clear that in this State we need more available dollars for affordable

175th Legislative Day

11/2/2007

housing. You probably all talked to the advocates and no matter what region of the state you are in, no matter what kind of constituency you represent, there is need for affordable housing in your community. This is something we should not ignore. The Amendments coming out of the Senate are reasonable, well written, and I think we should afford, excuse the pun, the opportunity for IHDA to piece together a capital program that would provide for dollars, so that we can be building units of affordable housing all over the State of Illinois. The state currently under invests in this area, I think we all know that. We've had other priorities. Some would argue, we've let this go for far too long. We may or may not have a capital Bill moving forward. I think we all hope that we will. And assuming we do, this Bill would set the stage for our ability to include affordable housing in that capital program. should be an important priority of the State of Illinois. And accordingly, I would recommend your 'aye' votes."

Speaker Hannig: "The Gentleman from Vermilion, Representative Black."

Black: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Hannig: "She indicates she'll yield."

Black: "Representative, the… let's get one thing straight. The underlying Bill that passed the House unanimously, that's all been stripped. There isn't any piece of the underlying Bill that still exists. That was a very simple Bill amending the Children and Family Services Act. All of that language is stripped from the Bill, correct?"

175th Legislative Day

11/2/2007

Feigenholtz: "Yes, it was."

- Black: "I thought so. Now, let me ask you one question. The Senate Amendments are, in my opinion, purposely vague. It talks about a capital program but doesn't identify the source and identifies no payment stream. How does that work?"
- Feigenholtz: "Representative Black, it's administered by IHDA and like any other bonding program it goes through the Department of Revenue. Is it..."
- Black: "All right. But IHDA has bonding authority available.

 Why do you need... Why do you need this Bill? If IHDA thinks this is important, why aren't they doing it?"
- Feigenholtz: "Well, Representative, I'm sure you know because you've been here for so long."
- Black: "Yeah, tell me about it."
- Feigenholtz: "That at every agency there are different pots of bonding, for instance, at IDOT you have transportation 'A'. And the... Where that money is spent is Transportation 'B', some might go... 'A' might go to bridges, 'B' might go to roads. This is just an opportunity to establish another fund, so that IHDA would be authorized to use this money for grants, mortgages, and loans to build, to preserve affordable housing for low-income and very low-There's also an opportunity to leverage income families. other dollars by establishing this fund."
- Black: "Representative, I think it's a noble idea; I really do.

 But I think once again, we have put this Bill in a cart and

 now we're looking for a horse to pull it. And I think the

 timing is such that I don't know where those horses are; I

175th Legislative Day

11/2/2007

don't know if they're going to appear in the Session without end. Mr. Speaker, to the Bill."

Speaker Hannig: "To the Bill."

"Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, here you're being Black: asked to vote on a rather vague bonding Bill to create affordable housing. Now, on the face of that, I'm not sure that I'm opposed to it philosophically. But you know, even in a small legislative district like I have, we have an active Habitat for Humanity Program that's trying to build at least one house a year. We now have at least one (1) church, possibly two (2), but one (1) church is building a home on some property that's owned by the church. are numerous programs that are addressing this. And let's not forget, the private sector; there's no limit to what capital can do. If you just get out of the road and let capital from mortgage lenders, and banks, and entrepreneurs, and developers. If there's a market, they'll try to fill that market. But Ladies and Gentlemen, what this Bill does is to create a bonding program that before we've even decided whether we're going to have a bonding program in the first place. Now, as the previous speaker said, this should be an important part of State Government and we should vote 'yes'. If that is a true statement, then put it in the bond Bill, put it in the Capital Bill. There's nothing to say you can't create a (10,000,000,000), item in the ten twelve line (12,000,000,000), fourteen (14,000,000,000) billion, whatever it turns out to be, capital infrastructure Bill that we may or may not ever vote on. But, put it in that

175th Legislative Day

11/2/2007

So, it's got a line item and everybody knows that it's going to take a billion (1,000,000,000), a billion and a half (1,500,000,000), or two (2,000,000,000). putting the cart before we have the horses ready to go. you vote for this, as Representative Winters said so eloquently earlier, you're diluting the pot of dollars that we can't even agree on, at this point, how much is in the pot, what the pot looks like, where the pot will be if there'll even be a pot. And if there is a pot, what will we spend it for? This is just out of sequence. If you really believe that IHDA isn't doing the job, that they faith based initiatives aren't doing the job, that community-based organizations aren't addressing this, then put a line item in the capital infrastructure Bill for affordable housing and that way we can vote on it and vote it up or vote it down. This is, to my way of thinking, a backdoor approach to get money for a program that may or may not be able to exist on its own as part of a Capital Bill. Until I see a Capital Bill, until I know what's in a Capital Bill, until I know what we're going to, spend it on, I'm not voting for any more capital projects. nickel and dime this State to death, and it is time to stop, and the time to stop. And the way to stop it is vote 'no'."

Speaker Hannig: "The Gentleman from Champaign, Representative Rose."

Rose: "Thank you. Will the Lady yield?"

Speaker Hannig: "Indicates she'll yield."

175th Legislative Day

11/2/2007

Rose: "Thank you. I just had a couple of questions and actually I think, Representative Black, an excellent point but I do have some questions. Who is eligible to receive this money? What are IHDA guidelines for getting the money?"

Feigenholtz: "Representative Rose, proprietorships, partnerships, for-profit-corporations, not-for-profit corporations, or units of local government."

Rose: "Do you have to be a U.S. citizen?"

Feigenholtz: "I don't know the answer to that. I can look..."

Rose: "Well, 'cause wasn't it IHDA that a couple years ago that was giving no-interest loans to illegal immigrants? Would you amend the Bill to specify that you have to be a U.S. citizen or a valid... validly existing corporation in the State of Illinois to qualify for this?"

Feigenholtz: "Representative, this Bill is on concurrence. I'd like to possibly have a chat with you after this."

Rose: "Well, we can chat but I'm not going to vote for this because as I recall IHDA did exactly that. And until I get some answers that assure me that this will not be the case, I'm not going to vote for the Bill and Bill Black has a pretty good point, too."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Mulligan."

Mulligan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Hannig: "She indicates she'll yield."

Mulligan: "Some of my colleagues would like to know if you felt the underlying Bill that was gutted was necessary or what happened to it, and how are you going to get by without it?"

175th Legislative Day

11/2/2007

Feigenholtz: "We have resolved this in another Bill, Representative Mulligan."

Mulligan: "Which other Bill?"

Feigenholtz: "I believe it was Senate Bill 68."

Mulligan: "So, it was no longer necessary. So, the Senate decided to strike out in their proposal for capital by designating it to things that they thought people might like to have."

Feigenholtz: "I believe so."

Mulligan: "What I find and I partially agree with some of the previous speakers, what I find problematic with what we're doing here is not what you're trying to fund, because certainly I think that it's a worthy cause. What I do find problematic here is spending all the money before we have it, creating a need for a Capital Bill that is gluttonous that you come a Bill out of the Senate that represents four (4) casinos. And so, what we're doing here is we're staking our claim on money we don't have for Bills that are really bad way out front. And yet, if I vote 'no' it indicates that I don't think this is important. Well, I do think it's important. Do I like what you're doing? No. I totally disagree with the way you're doing it. And some of us indicated that over the past several weeks, that we did not feel it was appropriate to go out and start staking claims to create a need. You know, over the past several years there have been many proposals to human service agencies and to providers that if you go along with this person or that person and back their plans or their schemes, we will give you money or we will give you this.

175th Legislative Day

11/2/2007

It's not forthcoming. I would like to go back to the way we did things, where we actually sat down and had a real dialogue about real terms and real way we administer things and real money, and how to do this correctly as opposed to the games that are being played. I understand where you're going with this. I don't like being hung out on it, on an issue that I think is important, on a vote that I may not want to give because I don't agree. And the same people that you would help with affordable housing, will be the same people that will be hurt by casinos and additional gambling in this State. So, I think there are some real inconsistencies here. So, what you've done by introducing this Bill, is you've precluded me from having a reasonable dialogue on how this will happen, by creating a need and an expectation in something that I think that's important. I think that's unfortunate? Yes, I think this whole year is unfortunate."

Speaker Hannig: "Is there any further discussion? Representative Feigenholtz, to close."

Feigenholtz: "Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I respect what I've heard from some of my colleagues, especially the grave concerns about the big capital Bill, which inevitably once it does pass, will likely be mammoth. The previous speaker works really hard as the spokesperson of the Human Services Appropriations Committee, which meets for hours and hours through the spring months, this year through the summer months. And she has heard as I'm sure others have, how important the housing component is for people who are in need of social services, people who are mentally ill or

175th Legislative Day

11/2/2007

developmentally disabled who are in desperate need of stability. And the first thing that gives them that stability is affordable housing and a roof over their head. Ask any social service specialist. Ask anyone from the housing coalitions in Illinois and from the mental health arena and that is what they tell you. First we need to find a place for people to live. There are large numbers of people right now, statewide, in downstate Illinois even for those downstaters, who spoke against the Bill, who are losing their rental support, their money is running out. that are Bills here always subject appropriation. This is a creating a vessel or a fund that potentially could yield a little bit more support so that we could create more affordable housing in the State of Illinois. And there's certainly no sin in attempting to do This capital Bill is going to be huge. And this Bill does not even put any money in it, but we should definitely consider establishing this fund and creating an opportunity for more affordable housing in the State of Illinois. I'd appreciate an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Hannig: "The question is, 'Shall the House concur in the Senate Amendments #1 and 3 and shall this Bill pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. The voting is open. This requires 60 votes. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 61 voting 'yes' and 47 voting 'no'. And the House does concur in Senate Amendments #1 and 3. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared

175th Legislative Day

11/2/2007

passed. We're going to go to page 8 of the calendar, under the Order of Senate Bills-Second Reading is Senate Bill 775. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Mahoney: "Senate Bill 775, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. Has been read a second time previously.

Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. No Floor Amendments. No Motions filed."

Speaker Hannig: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Mahoney: "Senate Bill 775, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Moffitt."

Moffitt: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, Ladies Gentlemen of the House. Certainly entertain any questions but first of all I want to thank the Leadership for allowing this Bill to advance. I want to thank Speaker Madigan. I want to thank Leader Cross and all of our staff that worked together to make it happen. You remember when we were in Session last time we had House Bill 1921, which would have dedicated one (1) penny (.01) of the current cigarette tax for a revenue stream for the Fire Prevention Fund. Long-term health care association providers were opposed to that in fear that it might compete for matching dollars. And of course, that's why the Governor vetoed it, This Bill, this Amendment, although we overrode it. becomes the Bill and this removes all opposition. want to just tell you why it's even better than the Bill that we had before. This will provide for a onetime transfer of fifteen million dollars (\$15,000,000) from the Fire Prevention Fund for the use by the fire service. We

175th Legislative Day

11/2/2007

can talk about how that will be spread, and annually, a minimum of seven point five million dollars (\$7,500,000). This will be money for our fire service around the state. It's the revenue stream that we've been working for, for years. We're using existing revenue and we're going to be able to help the fire service across the state. Again, it removes all opposition. The revenue is a stream that's there. And this is something we've been looking for, for years. So, I'd be happy to entertain any questions. But again, I thank the Leadership, colleagues on the other side of the aisle that help have advanced this: Representative Smith, Representative Holbrook, Representative Burke, and others. Be happy to entertain any questions, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Hannig: "The Gentleman moves for the passage of Senate Bill 775. And on that question, the Gentleman from Fulton, Representative Smith."

Smith: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill."

Speaker Hannig: "...the Bill."

Smith: "I rise in strong support of this legislation, and I want to begin by commending Representative Moffitt for the hard work he has put into this issue. And took a difficult situation during Veto Session and turned it around in a very positive way, and even a better for the fire service. His commitment for the fire service has been long-standing. This is, I think, landmark legislation. This is really making history in terms of providing financial assistance to our local fire departments. This is the best thing that we have done since the creation of the Zero Interest Revolving Loan Fund or Fire Trucks. This will provide more

175th Legislative Day

11/2/2007

money into that fund. It will provide for the first time, Revolving Loan Fund for Ambulances; money into the legislation we passed a couple of years ago. Will also provide grants to our local fire departments for some of their many needs beyond those big-ticket items, the fire trucks. So, I commend Representative Moffitt. I think this is great legislation and it'll be hugely received by the fire service. And I think we are doing really great work here today with the passage of this legislation. I would just reiterate, there are no new fees in this legislation, no fees whatsoever. This simply has to do with the distribution of the money that the state receives and this is putting it, rather than keeping it in a state fund that could be swept for other purposes. putting the money out on the streets to our firefighters, to our first responders who desperately need the help. So, Representative Moffitt, congratulations on a job well done. I encourage an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Hannig: Is there any further discussion? Then Representative Moffitt is recognized to close."

Moffitt: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Again, I appreciate your vote. This will be funding for the fire service across the State of Illinois. Removes all opposition. And I would just... of the fifteen million (15,000,000), which would have represented 2 years of revenue, the fire marshals' recommending that we put nine million (9,000,000) in the Fire truck Revolving Loan Fund, four million (4,000,000) in the ambulance, two million (2,000,000) in that new small grants. That will provide loans for thirty-six (36)

175th Legislative Day

11/2/2007

- additional fire trucks, forty (40) ambulances. It's going to help us all over. Thank you, everyone that's helped on this. And I urge an 'aye' vote. Thank you."
- Speaker Hannig: "The question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. The voting is open. This requires 71 votes. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 113 voting 'yes' and 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received a Three-fifths Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On page 17 of the Calendar, under the Order of Resolutions, Representative Saviano, you have House Resolution 416. So, Mr. Clerk, are there any Amendments?"
- Clerk Mahoney: "Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. Floor
 Amendment #2 has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Hannig: "Representative Saviano on the Amendment."
- Saviano: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Member of the House. I would ask that Floor Amendment #2 be adopted to House Resolution 416."
- Speaker Hannig: "On the Amendment, is there any discussion?

 Thou in favor say 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. The 'ayes' have

 it. And the Amendment is adopted. Are there any further

 Amendments?"
- Clerk Mahoney: "No further Amendments."
- Speaker Hannig: "Representative Saviano, you're recognized to present the Resolution."
- Saviano: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. House Resolution 416 simply calls for a task force to be set up for some hearings regarding the profession of naturopaths

175th Legislative Day

11/2/2007

We've been going around and around the last couple years and we haven't had enough time to educate the members on the benefits and the roles of naturopaths across the country and as well as in this state. They want to be licensed. We thought we'd have a full hearing and do some research on their profession. And this will allow us to accomplish that. And I would ask for its passage."

Speaker Hannig: "Is there any discussion? Then the question is, 'Shall House Resolution 416 be adopted?' All in favor vote 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 112 voting 'yes' and 0 voting 'no'. And the Resolution is adopted. Representative Rose, on page 17 of the Calendar, you have House Resolution 749. Representative Rose. Out of the record at the request of the Sponsor. On page 17 of the Calendar, Representative Smith, you have Senate Joint Resolution 72. Representative Smith."

Smith: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen, this is our usual Resolution with regard to the school waivers. And if you recall, the action we have to take is to disapprove certain waivers that the state board transmits to us or else they take effect. And so, there are a number of waivers that are addressed in this legislation. I'd be happy to answer any questions if any Members have any. This is a Resolution which came to us from the Senate. And we have had a hearing on this in the House Education Committee. We heard from testimony from some local

175th Legislative Day

11/2/2007

districts. I know of no serious opposition to this. I'd be happy to entertain any questions."

Speaker Hannig: "You heard the Gentleman's Motion. Is there any discussion? The Gentleman from Vermilion, Representative Black."

Black: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Hannig: He indicates he'll yield."

Black: "Representative, are we ever going to get out of this business?"

Smith: "Well, I..."

Black: "You know if I..."

Smith: "I would like to, yes."

Black: "If I wanted to be a supernumerary school board member, I'd run for that position. How am I supposed to vote on this? I don't know any of these districts on here. I don't know whether their requests are reasonable. I don't know how the people in the district, school district, feels about them. I've tried to get rid of it and your side of the aisle won't ever let the Bill get out of Rules. I don't know why we do this. But, that's a rhetorical question."

Smith: "That's a good point, Representative Black. I'd be happy to cosponsor the legislation."

Black: "Well, maybe you better Sponsor it and I'll cosponsor it. It might have a better chance of getting out of rules.

Remind me now, if we vote 'yes'..."

Smith: "I'm sorry, Representative Black."

Black: "If we vote 'yes', we're approving the waiver request, right?"

175th Legislative Day

11/2/2007

- Smith: "Well, actually, this Resolution approves some and disapproves some."
- Black: "Okay. What about the driver-ed fee increase waiver request. Are you asking us to vote for that or against that? There are several of them in there. The current fee is fifty dollars (\$50). There are about a half of dozen school districts that want to raise it to two hundred and fifty dollars (\$250). And there's one school district that wanted to raise it five hundred dollars (\$500). Is that on the approval list or the rejection list?"

Smith: "That is on the rejection list."

- Black: "Okay. So, if we... so, if they want to raise the drivered fee from the current fifty dollars (\$50) to two hundred and fifty dollars (\$250), then how do we vote on this guestion?"
- Smith: "Well, we have... we have allowed a two hundred and fifty dollar (\$250) fee. And so those, I believe, the state board will approve. It's anything above two hundred and fifty (\$250) dollars, we sort of set the limit at. Yeah. Representative Black, the state board has approved everything up to two hundred and fifty dollars (\$250). And we have traditionally stuck with that and have denied anything above two fifty (250)."
- Black: "All right. So, now, are we being asked to approve the state board's rejection or overrule the state board's rejection?

Smith: "We're being asked to approve it."

175th Legislative Day

11/2/2007

Black: "Okay. So, all... on this Bill then, all we are asking...
you're asking us to do is approve the denials made by the
state board? Correct?"

Smith: "That's right. That's right."

Black: "So, we don't to go through the 'no' means 'yes' and 'yes' means 'no'."

Smith: "That's right."

Black: "So, a 'yes' vote on this Bill upholds the denials made by the State Board of Education?"

Smith: "That is correct."

Black: "Okay. Fine. Thank you."

Hannig: "Representative Eddy."

Eddy: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Hannig: "Indicates he'll yield."

Eddy: "Representative, you did a real good... I just want to make sure on this drivers education fee increase people understand that if a school district requested something higher than two hundred and fifty dollars (\$250) and for example, wanted a the three hundred (300) or I think one of them wanted a five hundred dollar (\$500) increase this year. The State Board has kind of established, by practice, when they deal with waivers related to driver's ed, that they'll go with two fifty (250)."

Smith: "That's right."

Eddy: "Now, we've tried before to just kind of change the law so that the State Board's practice would become statute."

Smith: "Right. Right."

Eddy: "Everybody runs around worried about a fee increase and people climb in the holes and they worry and we never

175th Legislative Day

11/2/2007

really get it done. So, this is something they kind of done because they've had to."

Smith: "That's right. We've… we've kind of left it up to them and then I guess confirm what they do."

Eddy: "So, if someone who has a school district that's requested a five hundred dollar (\$500) increase in driver's education fee, if that Representative votes 'yes' on this, they actually, if they have a district that wanted more, they're kind of voting against their district because the 'yes' vote upholds the reduction."

Smith: "That's right."

Eddy: "So, that's what they really need to pay attention to individually, is if they have a school district that has made an issue out of the increase being necessary because of fuel or whatever. That's what they really need to pay attention to. But if they vote 'yes', excuse me, if they vote 'no' then, they are also voting against all of the other waivers in here that may have to do with physical education or holidays or a whole bunch of things they may agree with."

Smith: "That's right. That's the..."

Eddy: "The beauty of the system."

Smith: "I guess. Beauty, yes. Beauty is in the eye of the beholder, right?"

Eddy: "Okay. So, I think that's the most important thing is that people just recognize that they have some issues maybe related to their own school district here, that they may want to look at but if they do that then they're kind of

175th Legislative Day

11/2/2007

voting on the whole package because of the one issue. Is that accurate?"

Smith: "That's right. But if you vote 'no' really, you're allowing the whole thing to be approved. If we take no action then every waiver request is approved."

Eddy: "That's a good point and that was my next point. Is that if you really are against the State Board of Education being able to deal with waivers, reducing them, or denying them, if you think a school should be able to do whatever they want to do with physical education or holidays or anything else, if this doesn't pass then all of those waivers go into effect and really anybody can do just about anything they want to and this is the filter."

Smith: "That's right."

"Okay. Thank you very much. Ladies and Gentlemen, I Eddy: think... not going to recommend a vote on this, but I would just say if you're one of those Representatives of a district that wanted some action that was either denied or reduced by the State Board of Education, you may not want to vote for this. Because the district may feel very strongly. On the other hand, you will also be in effect probably voting against some things you think reasonable... reasonable denials by the State Board. Maybe it's a physical education denial, maybe it's a holiday waiver denial, who knows. They can vary. Just watch this very closely. Make sure you scroll through it and find out where your districts are on this. Thank you, Representative."

175th Legislative Day

11/2/2007

Hannig: "Is there any further discussion? The Lady from Lake, Representative May."

May: "Yes. Thank you, Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Hannig: "Indicates he'll yield."

May: "Yes. Representative, I'm concerned about waivers for physical education in our state because I'm concerned that children... about obesity in children and a healthy lifestyle. What are the reasons for the waiver from these four (4) schools for physical education? You know, is there any depth to their reason? Can you explain those four (4)?"

Smith: "Yeah. Representative May, that has been a concern of the Education Committee for a number of years. There are, I believe, four (4) P.E. waivers on here. They were all granted a 2 -year waiver, only. And so, normally, a waiver is a 5 -year process. This is for two 2 years only."

May: "So this... why do they want a P.E. waiver? Do they not have facilities? Is there a real good reason? Because..."

Smith: "Well, I think there's a variety of reasons. Often times it is because they don't have facilities. And I think the recognition was if we give them 2 years they can try to figure out a way in which they can offer P.E. I think that's the strong desire of the committee."

May: "So, if we vote 'no' they get a longer period?"

Smith: "I'm sorry."

May: "If we vote 'no' they get a 5 -year period?"

Smith: "That's correct. If you vote against the Resolution then you're allowing the waivers to be enacted as they were

175th Legislative Day

11/2/2007

presented. So, you essentially would be voting for a 5 year waiver."

May: "Okay. So, a 'yes' vote gives a very limited reason because these districts have presented some information that they don't have the facilities to do physical education. So, if you care about physical education and obesity and healthiness... healthy lifestyle for our children, you would vote 'yes' for a very limited waiver?"

Smith: "That's right."

May: "Thank you so much for that clarification, because I think so many of us are concerned about these issues of a healthy lifestyle. Because if the children learn in school and they need to let off steam and it's... it really is good. So, for those of us who are concerned, I think that that's a good reason to vote 'yes'. Thank you."

Hannig: "Is there any further discussion? Then Representative Smith, you're recognized to close."

Smith: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Again, this does become confusing, because we're taking kind of a negative action. We have to do this twice a year, either approve or disapprove waivers. And that's what this is about. It's a flawed system in my opinion, but the committee has gone through and been determined in our best judgment those that should be approved or disapproved and that's what this Resolution does. I'd ask for you support. And thank you very much."

Hannig: "Then the question is, 'Shall Senate Joint Resolution 72 be adopted?' All in favor vote 'aye'; opposed 'nay'.

The voting is open. This requires 60 votes. Have all

175th Legislative Day

11/2/2007

voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Sullivan, do you wish to be recorded? Representative Coladipietro, do you wish to be recorded? Okay. Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 103 voting 'yes' and 9 voting 'no'. And the Resolution is adopted. So, we're going to jump out of order for just a moment to allow the Clerk to do the Agreed Resolutions, but we're not preparing to adjourn. So, Mr. Clerk, would you read the Agreed Resolutions."

Clerk Mahoney: "On the Order of Agreed Resolutions is House Resolution 779, offered by Representative Brosnahan. Resolution 780, offered by Representative Franks. Resolution 781, offered by Representative Flider. House Resolution 782, offered by Representative Chapa LaVia. House Resolution 783, offered by Representative Howard. House Resolution 784, offered by Representative Froehlich. House Resolution 785, offered by Representative Ryg. Resolution 786, offered by Representative Howard. House Resolution 787, offered by Representative Black. House Resolution 788, offered by Representative Gordon. Resolution 789, offered by Representative John Bradley. House Resolution 790, offered by Representative John Bradley. House Resolution 791, offered by Representative House Resolution 792, offered by Representative Dunkin. House Resolution 793, offered by Representative Gordon. House Resolution 794, offered by Representative Reis. Rose. House Resolution 795, offered by Representative Cross. House Resolution 796, offered by Representative

175th Legislative Day

11/2/2007

- Howard. House Resolution 797, offered by Representative Flider. House Resolution 798, offered by Representative Reis. House Resolution 799, offered by Representative Crespo. House Resolution 800, offered by Representative Bellock. House Resolution 801, offered by Representative Kosel. House Resolution 802, offered by Representative Monique Davis. House Resolution 803, offered by Representative Reis. House Resolution 804, offered by Representative Biggins. House Resolution 806, offered by Representative Hamos. House Resolution 813, offered by Representative Golar. And House Joint Resolution 79, offered by Representative John Bradley."
- Hannig: "Representative Currie moves for the adoption of the Agreed Resolutions. All in favor say 'aye'; opposed 'nay'.

 The 'ayes' have it. And the Agreed Resolutions are adopted.

 Mr. Clerk, read the Committee Reports."
- Clerk Mahoney: "Representative Currie, Chairperson from the Committee on Rules, to which the following legislative measures and/or Joint Action Motion were referred, action taken on November 02, 2007, reported the same back with the following recommendation/s: 'approved for floor consideration' is Amendment #5 to Senate Bill 783."
- Speaker Turner: "Representative Turner in the Chair. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Osterman, for what reason do you rise?"
- Osterman: "Glad you're in the Chair, Representative Turner...

 Speaker Turner. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, it's approaching noon and we're here to deal with a lot of these large issues before us. My question to the Chair is, there

175th Legislative Day

11/2/2007

are hundreds of thousands of people in Chicagoland area that are waiting on our action. They have to make plans for how to get to work on Monday. And question is, where we at and where we going to resolve this issue before then? If there is any direction from the Chair on action that's going on in this building to solve this problem."

- Speaker Turner: "Representative, the Chair just bought a new GPS system and I'm still reading the instructions on how it operates and within the next hour I should be able to tell you what the directions are. But it is a brand new GPS system. I don't care to mention the brand name over the air but it does work. I do know it's charged up. But I can probably give you better direction in about an hour. Once I've, you know, get through the directions and see exactly if they're correct."
- Osterman: "Well, we look forward to that direction as do our constituents because they're waiting and watching to see how we resolve this, on a lot of different levels. So, I would hope that all of us are focused on that and don't intend to leave until we get that resolved."
- Speaker Turner: "The Gentleman from Vermilion, Representative Black, do you know how to operate GPS systems?"
- Black: "Do I know how to operate a GPS system? I don't even know what a GPS system is. Is it a wristwatch? I just heard somebody tell me what it is. Good political sense. And it's obvious we don't have one of those here. An inquiry of the Chair."

Speaker Turner: "State your inquiry."

175th Legislative Day

11/2/2007

Black: "I certainly share the concerns of the previous speaker. Only mine, I think, is important from Chicago to Cairo. We have millions of school children who could be attending classes in some jeopardy if we do not get a budget implementation Bill passed today. I would hate to see a re-formulation of state aid, downward. I'd hate to think how many dollars in interest money school districts in my legislative district have already lost. And some, maybe in a position by the end of the month, there going to have to either pay teachers in script or lay some off. And I don't know how they'll do that, since most of them are covered under a negotiated contract. Perhaps you can tell us if your GPS system knows when we might consider a budget implementation Bill for education?"

Speaker Turner: "Representative, I think that's been a difficulty of my system it's trying to do education and transportation all on the same map."

Speaker Turner: "I see."

Black: "But we are working at it and I've been told that this system is state of the art technology, capable of doing four (4) and five (5) things at the same time. And..."

Black: "That would be a first around here in some months."

Speaker Turner: "Well, we hope it works."

Black: "All right."

Speaker Turner: "You know. We know the attempt and we can appreciate that. But like as I told the previous speaker, I would think within the next hour we should be able to address a few of those concerns. I like you, I have some concerns about that train from Cairo to Chicago."

175th Legislative Day

11/2/2007

Black: "That's true."

Speaker Turner: "There's a guy down there that I know. He may not be able to come home for Thanksgiving, and his mom wouldn't appreciate that. So, we're going to do all we can."

Black: "I understand."

Speaker Turner: "Old cars and old tires..."

Black: "Well, would it do us any good for the chamber to follow it's own mandate and we observe a moment of silence before every Bill, to reflect... to reflect silently if you will, on the ethicacy of each Bill before we decide it? I mean, if it's good enough for the school kids, surely it's goon enough for us."

Speaker Turner: "Yeah, but..."

Black: "I'll ask the Chair at the appropriate time."

Speaker Turner: "Thank you, Representative."

Black: "A moment of silence or reflection upon the various Bills we might be asked to debate before the day is over."

Speaker Turner: "Give me a moment to think about it."

Black: "And I'll take a moment to think about it, as well. And if we can get everybody else to just take a moment of silence. I'm mourning all of those Bills that passed on before they had a chance to be passed. Think how many Bills have died on this Calendar this year, and those yet to see life."

Speaker Turner: "There's a few that have died after they left this chamber, also."

Black: "More than a few."

175th Legislative Day

11/2/2007

- Speaker Turner: "So, it's... death appears to be inevitable around. At some point, some place. It could happen any time, anywhere."
- Black: "That would take... to mourn those Bills would take (5) minutes of silence."
- Speaker Turner: "The Gentleman from Winnebago, Representative Winters, for what reason do you rise?"
- "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise in a point of Winters: information. I was just handed a brochure that I think might be of interest to the Members of the Body. It's a training program called 'Excelling as a Fist Time Manager of Supervisor'. I want to read some of the highlights and note that it might be applicable in our situation. 'How to deal with disagreements without escalating the problem. How to use our listening skills to create a caring and understanding workplace. Dealing with procrastination and other time robbers.' We'd never see that here. And how to keep your cool and stay motivated even in the most heated moments.' Now, I would note that there is no seminar location for Chicago, but on January 16 in Springfield, this is available at the low, low cost that probably could be charged to the state taxpayers of a hundred and ninetynine dollars (\$199). And I suggest that this Body encourage all of the current Leaders to attend this seminar. They might get some tips on how to manage our state's budget and get us through next year before we have to spend a hundred and 175 legislative days in Session. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

175th Legislative Day

11/2/2007

- Speaker Turner: "Did you say the cost was one ninety-nine (199)?"
- Winters: "One ninety-nine (199) a piece."
- Speaker Turner: "That may break the budget."
- Winters: "It won't break the budget and it might get us much further down the road than we are this year."
- Speaker Turner: "Mr. Clerk, we have Senate Bill 783. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Mahoney: "Senate Bill 783 has been read a second time, previously, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government.

 Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. Floor Amendments 2, 3, and 5, have all been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Turner: "The Gentleman from Montgomery, Representative Hannig."
- Hannig: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would... I would withdraw Amendments 2 and 3."
- Speaker Turner: "Representative Hannig moves to withdraw Amendments 2 and 3 to Senate Bill 783. All those in favor say 'aye'; all those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it and the Amendments are withdrawn. Further Amendments, Mr. Clerk?"
- Clerk Mahoney: "Floor Amendment #5, offered by Representative Hannig, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Turner: "The Gentleman from Montgomery, Representative Hannig, on Amendment #5."
- Hannig: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House.

 This is the budget implementation language. I'd ask that
 we adopt the Amendment and then I'll explain the Bill as

175th Legislative Day

11/2/2007

amended and answer any questions. So, I move for the adoption of the Amendment."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Hannig moves for the adoption of the Amendment #5. All those in favor say 'aye'; all those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair the 'ayes' have it. Amendment #5 is adopted. Further Amendments?"

Clerk Mahoney: "No further Amendments. No Motions filed."

Speaker Turner: "Third Reading. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Mahoney: "Senate Bill 783, a Bill for an Act concerning

State Government. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Hannig."

Hannig: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. need to pass a budget implementation Bill in order to make the spending Bill that we passed in August complete. So a budget consists of the appropriation Bill and the budget implementation Bills. So what we have here today is the budget implementation Bills that need to go to the Governor in order to fulfill the promises that we made in the spending Bill. Now, for those Members on our side of the aisle, I've walked through these with us yesterday in caucus and I don't intend to cover all the items again, but let me just assure you that everything that I talked about in our House Democratic Caucus is in this proposal. But let me talk about a few highlights, as well. And so, for example, in order to meet our commitment to nursing homes, we need to provide for a rate increase by statute. budget implementation would do that. The Community DD Service Medicaid Trust Fund needs to have this language in

175th Legislative Day

11/2/2007

order to increase capacity, something we promised them in the spending Bill. This Budget Implementation Act fulfills special that promise. The education personnel reimbursement that we talked about during the ... during the budget debate that would increase from eight thousand (8,000) to nine thousand (9,000), the amount that reimburse for certified teacher and twenty-eight hundred (2800) to thirty-five hundred (3500) for the staff. money is in the spending Bill, that's now final. implementation language to budget fulfill promise. The transitional assistant language that provides that each school district will receive at least as much money in '08 as they received in '07, that's in this budget implementation level. And the promise that we made back in August to raise the foundation by four hundred dollars (\$400), the money's in the budget, but we need to have this budget implementation Bill in order to make that promise a reality. And the same is true with the poverty grant hold harmless. There's some language in here to adjust the 718 Fund in a way that was negotiated by Members of the Human Services Committee to provide that more money would go to providers. There's language in this Bill to extend the Road Fund cap to FY08 so that the State Police and the Secretary of State will continue to have enough money to pay their employees and avoid layoffs in those agencies. There's some cleanup language in the corporate loophole Bill that we passed last year, particularly with the auto leasing and the manufacturing machinery and equipment exemption expansion is in this language, as well.

175th Legislative Day

11/2/2007

addition, late last night, early today, some agreed language came into the Bill to deal with the Hospital Basic Service Preservation Act. It's simply a cleanup that the Treasurer requested to ensure that conflicting language that currently exists in the statutes could be clarified. So this is some of the things that this Bill does. Obviously, there are more. I'd be happy to answer any questions, but I think it's very important that we all understand that we need to pass this Bill in order to fulfill the promises that we made back in August with the spending Bill."

Speaker Turner: "The Gentleman from Crawford, Representative Eddy, for what reason do you rise?"

Eddy: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Turner: "Indicates he will."

Eddy: "Representative, just for clarification purposes, let's go... Amendment #5 becomes the Bill, then?"

Hannig: "That's correct."

Eddy: "So, any of the other versions don't mean... this is the
 entire package?"

Hannig: "Right, ignore the other versions, Amendment #5 is the Bill."

Eddy: "Okay. All right. So one of the… in the education portion, one of the issues related to the implementation has to do with the… what's known as the ADA, Average Daily Attendance safety block grant."

Hannig: "That's correct."

Eddy: "School districts receive a certain amount per student.

The implementation language in this case extends payment of

175th Legislative Day

11/2/2007

this block grant to... for the first time, nonpublic schools. Is that correct?"

Hannig: "That was the agreement that was reached back in August and this was the language that was agreed to at this time and it's in this Bill."

Eddy: "Okay. As it then relates to the budget that passed, the agreement originally included an additional appropriation in the appropriation's portion of the budget to ensure that no school district would receive less money or the attempt was to make sure school districts didn't receive less money, but that appropriation amount was reduced. Is that correct?"

Hannig: "I... I... could you restate the question? I'm not certain I understood it."

Eddy: "The original amount in the appropriation's portion of the budget included an increase in the line item for the ADA block grant..."

Hannig: "Yes. I think it was..."

Eddy: "...that would've really kind of held everybody..."

Hannig: "Right."

Eddy: "...harmless from a reduction."

Hannig: "We would add the private schools into the ADA calculation and I think we added like ten million (10,000,000)..."

Eddy: "That's right."

Hannig: "...in order to fund that."

Eddy: "That's right. Now, the Governor reduced that amount."

175th Legislative Day

11/2/2007

Hannig: "The Governor reduced that. We actually overrode the Governor in this chamber on that item, but the Senate sustained his Veto."

Eddy: "The Senate did not. So, the net effect is that there's is a potential, depending on how many private schools applied for the funding, because they do have to apply. That with the same appropriation, school districts will get less money than they would've because of the reduction the Governor made and the Senate has upheld."

Hannig: "Well, let me just say that in the area of transitional assistance, the language would say that no school district will get less money than they did last year. So when they add up their general state aid, their categoricals and everything..."

Eddy: "Understood, but in that..."

Hannig: "So no one will actually be reduced."

Eddy: "I understand that. So if a district doesn't receive a lot of state aid, general state aid, and they just lose in that but the total amount that they receive from the state if less because of that reduction, they will get it in transition assistance. However, I guess my point here is, and what I'm hoping we can do is at some point once we know what the figure is, once we know how many private schools have applied for the actual grant amount and if there is then that reduction that I anticipate happening because of the reduced pool and the additional numbers, this is something we could address in the supplemental somewhere?"

Hannig: "Absolutely, Representative. I don't think that anyone that was for this proposal in August has given up on this

175th Legislative Day

11/2/2007

- idea. We simply believe that we need to find another means to get this item finalized in the budget. So a supplemental would be, I think, the best way."
- Eddy: "And it's something obviously we would support, you would support that... in the notion of making sure that those districts were made whole, so to speak, regarding the..."
- Hannig: "Yes. I think that there was an agreement made that we should do this and there was an agreement made that we should fund this and we need to ensure that before the end of the fiscal year that we meet both of those. That we fund this item at the appropriate level."
- Eddy: "Okay. Thank you. Now, as far as other items that were in the original implementation language regarding education that are not contained in this version, for example, there was money originally and it's appropriated for intervention teams for low-performing schools. However, the implementation language is not included. Same goes for that, that is still open for possible discussions in the future?"
- Hannig: "Yes, I think when the respective staffs met and went through, there was a view, and I think an appropriate one, that since we seem to be here quite a number of days, that we should try to limit this particular proposal to those items that we need today to implement the budget. But there are other items certainly that could be addressed in Bills that could be stand alone Bills that could move forward. So Representative, I think many of us would support what you're proposing, but I think the consensus

175th Legislative Day

11/2/2007

was, at least between our respective parties, that that was not something that we should include in the 'bimp'."

Eddy: "Okay. So, another issue has to do with mentoring programs for superintendents. If that becomes necessary, that's something that we can continue to work on. Than..."

Hannig: "Yeah, and typically those are the kind of things that we would pass as stand alone Bills."

Eddy: "Right."

Hannig: "When we came to the end of August and we thought, well, we're not going to be back for awhile, let's roll everything we need to do into a 'bimp' Bill. Well, now here we are in November, we know we'll be back, you know, at some point to deal with capital, to deal with mass transit. In the second Wednesday in January, we start all over again, so we'll be here."

Eddy: "Well, I appre..."

Hannig: "And I think we can deal with those issues."

Eddy: "I appreciate that and I appreciate the recognition of those. There was one other issue related to this that got some attention regarding language that was related to the Secretary of State and the way certain authority was going to be handled but I understand any language related to that is not in this version?"

Hannig: "That's my understanding."

Eddy: "Okay. Thank you. Very quickly, to the Bill. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this is what we have been discussing for quite some time regarding the major components of the implementation of the education Bill. This is the four hundred dollar (\$400) foundation level

175th Legislative Day

11/2/2007

increase. This is the first increase in special education reimbursement for certified and noncertified staff in over 20 years. The money's in the budget. Today is the day that the State Board of Education has indicated, is kind of the date they have to recalculate payments that school districts across the state, seven hundred and twenty-six (726) school districts, would actually receive less state aid than they did last year if this doesn't pass and it doesn't get through the Senate and have action by the Governor. The urgency of this is obvious and I would urge this Body to unite behind this implementation Bill and everyone vote 'yes'. Send it to the Senate so the Governor can act on it today. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "The Lady from Cook, Representative Nekritz, for what reason do you rise?"

Nekritz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd just like to follow up on one of the points that the previous speaker made with regard to the ADA block grant money. I am delighted that we are impl... that we're using this particular piece of legislation to implement the increased foundation level and the increased special ed personnel reimbursement, because those are things that will benefit all of our districts. I'm a little distressed, however, that as the Sponsor said, you know, those are items that we need to do today and that the items in this 'bimp' Bill are the things we need to do today and I find that a little contradictory with regard to the ADA block grant money because that money was actually cut out of the budget and so I don't know why we need to implementing a new formula today when the money for that is

175th Legislative Day

11/2/2007

not even in the budget. So, while I have some concerns about that and I look forward to working together with everyone in the chamber on making sure that that money gets included in a supplemental, which I think is the only way we're going to resolve this. I still, you know still, support many of the other things in this Bill and will be voting 'yes'. But again, I think that that's something that we're going to have to keep an eye on because our public schools are going to be losing money from this depending... and the amount that they're going to be losing will depend on how much the nonpublic school... how many of the nonpublic schools apply, and that we can't determine today. But it is a loss for our public schools and I am disappointed about that. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative McCarthy, for what reason do you rise?"

McCarthy: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Turner: "Indicates he will."

McCarthy: "Gary, the general state aid payment for the schools is not subject to appropriation, correct?"

Hannig: "The... which... could you restate the question?"

McCarthy: "The regular general state aid payment to the public schools, is that subject to appropriation?"

Hannig: "Well, the... there's two (2) parts, Representative. So we appropriate money on the one hand and then we direct the State Board of Education through a 'bimp' Bill to spend in a certain way, and so with the foundation, we say so much per student. So, we've appropriated additional money for general state aid, an additional four hundred dollars

175th Legislative Day

11/2/2007

(\$400) per student, but until we pass this Budget Implementation Act and tell the agency to give this additional money, they continue to... they continue to give money out at last year's level. So we need this Bill..."

McCarthy: "Okay."

Hannig: "...to get them up to the amount that we appropriated."

McCarthy: "But as far as the transitional assistance on page 299 of the Bill, they talk about the transitional assistance and how they look at the 2007 numbers, FY07, they see what the FY08 numbers come up to according to formula, they look at the difference and they're going to at least guarantee them the 2007 number."

Hannig: "Yes."

McCarthy: "But it does say right in there that that is subject to appropriation and is that... I mean... after they figure out these new numbers are you confident that there's enough money in the appropriation that anyone who is counting on that transitional assistance won't be disappointed?"

Hannig: "So, we've appropriated money in the budget for that purpose, Representative."

McCarthy: "And for the..."

Hannig: "For the transitional assistance."

McCarthy: "But..."

Hannig: "Until we do the new spending plan."

McCarthy: "The new formula... Okay, and you're confident that there's enough money in there that when those transitional assistance numbers are figured..."

Hannig: "We..."

175th Legislative Day

11/2/2007

McCarthy: "...the appropriation that's already made will be sufficient enough to fulfill all the obligations under the transitional assistance?"

Hannig: "We believe that is the case, Representative, but if we're wrong we can do a supplemental."

McCarthy: "Okay."

Hannig: "And I think all of us... all of us would support that concept."

McCarthy: "Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "The Gentleman from Vermilion, Representative Black, for what reason do you rise?"

Black: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, a moment of silent reflection, if I might. That's long enough, we didn't define moment, so will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Turner: "He indicates he will."

Black: "Representative Hannig, under the education portion of the Budget Implementation Act, item 15, Lincoln's Challenge Feasibility Study. Where did that come from?"

Hannig: "That was a request from the Senate Republicans that was to apart of the final budget agreement. And again, we're just honoring those commitments we made."

Black: "The current Lincoln's Challenge program is located in my district in Rantoul on the site of the former Chanute Air Force Base. In December, they will graduate their ten thousandth (10,000) student. It was created in 1993, it's an excellent second-chance program. But Ladies and Gentlemen, let me tell ya why I think fifteen (15) is repugnant to me. The current class of cadets at Lincoln Challenge Academy, they get a ten dollar (\$10.00) a week

175th Legislative Day

11/2/2007

stipend for personal supplies, so... shaving cream, stuff They're being paid on an erratic like that, shampoo. basis. The boiler failed about four (4) or five (5) weeks ago. The cadets had to march some distance to Grissom Hall in order to take a shower so they'd have hot water. they would march back in their sweats and get sweaty and then as I was visiting there about a week ago, the cadets were telling me they would then have to go to bed wearing all the sweat clothes that they could get on, they're only issued two (2) blankets and they had no heat. Now, I don't know whether this boiler is going to make it through the winter or not, and there's no money in the Department of Military Affair's budget to replace that boiler and that is our obligation not the Village of Rantoul in the lease agreement that we have. And there's been persistent rumors and rumors are what you expect them to be. The Adjutant General visited with Senator Frerichs and myself about a week ago, was very impressed with the program. For those of you in Chicago, about 60 percent of the cadets in Lincoln Challenge come from the City of Chicago. We used to get a four hundred thousand (400,000)... excuse me, a five hundred thousand dollar (\$500,000) grant from the Chicago Public Schools to help defray the cost, but the Chicago Public Schools had to stop that about 3 or 4 years ago because of their own budgetary problems and we have not made the necessary appropriations. I would hate to see this program canceled. I would hate to see these students have to leave in the next three (3) weeks if we... if the boiler breaks down... they have two: one

175th Legislative Day

11/2/2007

irreparable and one is limping along, literally, with duct tape and dedicated servicemen and women who manage to keep the thing running most of the time. If they don't have a boiler, then it affects even their food preparation. I'd like all of you to visit and maybe we could set that up sometime since we're in Session constantly and Rantoul isn't far from here, all we have to do is go over to I-57. But I'm really concerned that we would do a feasibility study on another replication of Lincoln's Challenge when we are so miserably failing to maintain the one we have. has a proven track record. We talked to three (3) of the cadets who graduated in the last class, all of them are in college. One wants to become a paramedic, one is studying to be a teacher, and one wants to go into social work. there could've been more than that, but they just picked three (3) who were still in the area. They've had an excellent program of giving kids a second chance. are kids who were failed. I'm not going to say they failed, there's always a part of that, we all know that. But the system, for whatever the reason, failed these kids and many of them talked about how this program has rescued their life and have really turned them around. And I'm just sad to see this put in by the Senate Republicans when I have let our deputy chief of staff know and some of the Members on our side of the aisle, this program is in absolute jeopardy of not being able to finish this current class and I think their graduation is scheduled about the second or third week in December. I hope they make it and I hope we'll prepare for another class. But we have to

175th Legislative Day

11/2/2007

have a boiler, the air conditioning system quit last They were very pleasant days. These are old military dormitories, Ladies and Gentlemen, very small rooms with, if you're lucky, a window that works, and it gets it rather warm in there. So, I'm not going to challenge it. I don't expect us to take it out, but I would like to issue the challenge that we need to fund what we have before we go off on feasible studies. the article put out by the Auditor General was very interesting in the last 48 hours. He's trying to figure out what some of these state programs do and he's having a heck of a time and at least he's honest enough to say, 'I don't have a clue what some of these programs do and I don't think they do either.' We continually replicate, duplicate, start off new programs and let the ones we have suffer. Under another heading, Representative, under the item 26, 'allow agencies other than the Illinois Housing Development Authority to spend from the Illinois Affordable Housing Trust Fund for one (1) year.' Now, I begin to see why we passed the bond Bill about an hour ago. But could you tell me, Representative, what does a transfer of one and a half million (1,500,000) to the Department of Corrections Reimbursement and Education Fund, which pays for inmates' housing construction. What is that?"

Hannig: "It's my understanding, Representative, that there's a surplus amount of money in these funds that we would then transfer into the IHDA Fund, which is along the lines of what we did last year, as well."

175th Legislative Day

11/2/2007

- Black: "Well, my language says 'transfer to' the Department of Corrections, not 'from'."
- Hannig: "Excuse me, I did say it incorrectly. It's from the Housing Fund to the other funds, Representative."
- Black: "What is the inmates housing construction? Is that affordable housing?"
- Hannig: "So, I'm advised that it's housing for inmates who are within the Department of Corrections."
- Black: "Housing for inmates that are within the Department of Corrections. Would those be cells? Would they be half-way houses? Would they honeymoon cottages inside the walls of Joliet State Prison?"
- Hannig: "Representative..."
- Black: "Would they be luxury apartments?"
- Hannig: "We believe that it's... we believe that it's the item that... that any of those items could qualify, Representative, probably except for the honeymoon suites. And..."
- Black: "You know, one never knows. And then we're going to transfer 2.2 million (2,200,000) to the Children Services Fund, which pays for foster care. Right? I don't have a problem with that, but what does that have to do with Affordable Housing Trust?"
- Hannig: "It would... this again, would be for housing needs, though."
- Black: "Well, I understand that. But an hour ago, as only this Body can do, we had to create a bond program so we could build affordable housing. And yet, here we are an hour

175th Legislative Day

11/2/2007

later transferring money out of the Affordable Housing Trust Fund to other items."

Hannig: "In this case, we're authorizing this for one (1) year. Now, we can revisit it next year and do it or not do it. But we're saying that this year, we know that there's money that exists in that program, there are needs in other places. And so, we're suggesting that we could make that swap this year."

Black: "Well, this Body passed it, so we'll live with it, but only for 1 year. I'm reminded of what Ronald Reagan said about 1 -year government programs. And if I could paraphrase it, 'The closest thing you'll ever to see to eternal life on this planet is a 1 -year government program.' I'm sure... I won't be here, but I'm sure it will be renewed, renewed, ad infinitum. And yet, an hour ago, we create a bond fund for affordable housing and now an hour later, we transfer money out of the Affordable Housing Trust Fund. And then we wonder why people look at us the way they do when we go home. Can't say that I blame them. Mr. Speaker, to the Bill. This isn't as glitzy as the RTA and CTA. The Chicago media isn't really too interested in the budget implementation Bill. You know, it doesn't make noise. It isn't a new car for the subway or the EL. It isn't as nice as a shiny new bus, but at long last, we've at least agreed to pass a budget implementation Bill. Have we no shame? Have we no shame that we have to sit here and do this on November the 2nd? And the games that we've played, even to get to this point. And I won't ask the Sponsor if he has any assurances that this Bill

175th Legislative Day

11/2/2007

will pass the Senate, I don't know what'll pass the Senate anymore. Couldn't hazard a guess. I hope it does. But this is every bit as important, if not more so than the RTA and CTA. And we've taken too long, and we've played too many games. And I for one will accept my share of blame and shame. This should not be done on November the 2nd. We have cost school districts millions of dollars in lost interest on the money they should've received beginning July 1. Shame on us. But at least it's here, better late than never, and I assume it will pass unanimously."

Speaker Turner: "Gentleman from Lake, Representative Beaubien, for what reason do you rise?"

Beaubien: "Yes. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Turner: "Indicates he will."

Beaubien: "Just very briefly, I want to point out to the legislative group the items under what we call revenue and maybe I'll just make a brief statement and you can possibly agree or disagree. But the sourcing rules have been eliminated, that's something that the banks had request that be removed and I believe in the... in the initial Bill, it was sort of an inadvertent addition. It was not intended to cover that particular issue. Is that basically correct?"

Hannig: "Yes. It's my understanding this is agreed sourcing language from the banking community, Representative."

Beaubien: "All right. And we're also eliminating the double taxation on the sales tax exemption, that we're putting that back in for the automobile leasing groups?"

Hannig: "For the rental car agencies, yes."

175th Legislative Day

11/2/2007

Beaubien: "All right. And we're also reinstating the favorable tax treatments for federal bonds. And I believe, the reason for that was that some institutions would be subject to it and others, such as credit unions, would not. Is that correct, also? So, those three..."

Hannig: "Yes."

Beaubien: "...so those three (3) items are out. And just a very brief comment on the manufacturing equipment exemption, it's ten million dollars (\$10,000,000). I believe the chamber would possibly say we wish it was more money, but this is the amount we have to deal with at this point."

Hannig: "Yes. The cap, I think, was an effort to try and measure how much this actually will cost the State of Illinois. Some would argue that it may not cost ten million (10,000,000), but others would say that it would be much more than that. So, it's an opportunity to have this... this credit on the books and measure how successful it is on the one hand with jobs and how much it costs us."

Beaubien: "Okay. Thank you. Just to the Bill and to the Members of the General Assembly, this has been a labor that's taken far too long, but it's something we need to pass and move forward. So I would urge all the Members to vote 'aye' on this Bill. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "The Lady from Lake, Representative May, for what reason do you rise?"

May: "Yes. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Turner: "Indicates he will."

May: "Yes. Representative, thank you so much for your concise explanation about how this is the implementation of the

175th Legislative Day

11/2/2007

budget, but I'm drawn to one item because I'm thinking a lot about different ways of transportation: planes, trains, and automobiles. And I do see… iFly transfer for 1.32 million (1,320,000). So, is this something that was in our original appropriations budget?"

Hannig: "Yes."

May: "And this is just the implementation of that?"

Hannig: "Actually, it was a program that we started last year and, we again, extended the money in the spending side this year and again we need on a 1 -year basis to extend the substantive language."

May: "Well, let me just say one thing. I see that it provides critical air service. But, you know, planes are still types of transportation and what's on my mind, while it's very important that we pass this Bill for our schools and all, but this is for out of Cook County air service. Are there any buses? Are there any trains? Are there any other types of transportation that are going to be funded by this outside of Cook County? Is it strictly airplanes?"

Hannig: "Yes. This is for a program that was created last year where we tried to give some incentives to three (3) downstate communities: Marion, Decatur, and Quincy, who had come to us and said that they had... they had an opportunity to get flights from their airports, their regional airport, to Chicago, but that they probably needed some state subsidy in order to get these operational. So we agreed that we would work with them. So last year we put money into the budget, we made an authorization to spend it if necessary. This year we're doing the same

175th Legislative Day

11/2/2007

thing. There's already money in the budget and this would be the authorization for another year."

May: "But it is... it is... excuse me, for interrupting. But it is public transportation, anyone who could pay the fare would get this subsidy."

Hannig: Yes. Yes, that's correct. It's not a private airline."

May: "Okay. And this is... this is public transportation. I'm sorry to make it at your expense on this very important Bill, but I just have to say that for many of us, my daughter will barely speak to me because of what happening and how she and her friends get to work Chicago. A lot of my constituents from my district can get on the Metra train; some of them will be cut. The shuttle bug services to the Metra trains, and then they need to take a CTA bus to get to their jobs in Chicago. So here's 1.32 million (1,320,000) that we are getting in this 'bimp' Bill for public transportation. Now it's a plane, it's a plane, but it's a downstate. But there are many other public transportation issues that are before us. And I'm sorry again, but I must make this point because my constituents are saying, stop playing around, fix the problem, do what you need to do. Now, I know that other Representatives they've said, sometimes we're too nice. We're not pounding our shoes on the desk. I'm pounding my shoes on the desk to say, we need to do something about I'm tired of being a nice suburban transportation. I'm going to start yelling, we need Representative. transportation. Thank you."

175th Legislative Day

11/2/2007

- Speaker Turner: "That's not nice. The Lady from Cook, Representative Davis, for what reason do you rise?"
- Davis, M.: "Thank you. I can't follow that, so I won't try. Will the Speaker yield?"
- Speaker Turner: "Indicates he will."
- Davis, M.: "Representative Hannig, I'm looking at the elimination of the digital divide. What agency will those funds be available in?"
- Hannig: "I believe it's the Department of Commerce and Economic Opportunity."
- Davis, M.: "And people can apply for those grants, is that correct?"
- Hannig: "Yes, that's correct, Representative."
- Davis, M.: "Okay. And the other one I think is thirty-one (31)..."
- Hannig: "The predatory landing?"
- Davis, M.: "That's correct."
- Hannig: "So, we have a substantive Bill in place and we need to have some initial money to get this proposal up and running. We think that is, in the out years, that it will be able to become more self-funding."
- Davis, M.: "And exactly how will that work, Representative?"
- Hannig: "Well, what this will do is, this Bill will do is transfer the money so that the predatory lending data base program can go forward. So in other words, this just transfers the money. The underlying program already exists. So this is just the startup money to get the program going."

175th Legislative Day

11/2/2007

- Davis, M.: "So that we can help those who have been affected or are constantly being affected by predatory lenders in the State of Illinois?"
- Hannig: "Right. It's an effort to try to help people understand, when they're interested in buying a house, that some of these proposals are not quite what they appear to be..."
- Davis, M.: "I think..."
- Hannig: "And so, we want to try to help people understand what's happening."
- Davis, M.: "I think it's an excellent program. I think it may be a model for the country in order to stop the foreclosures and stop people from becoming homeless, because people are taking advantage of their lack of knowledge in that particular industry. And to the four hundred dollars (\$400) for each student from the Common School Fund?"

Hannig: "Yes."

- Davis, M.: "Now each student, who is in private or public school, will benefit from that. Is that correct?"
- Hannig: "The foundation, the four hundred (400), is just for the public schools. But the Average Daily Attendance block grant..."
- Davis, M.: "They would benefit it."
- Hannig: "...would be available for all students."
- Davis, M.: "To the Bill, Mr. Speaker. I do believe that all children will benefit from this legislation, even though, our budget this portion is late in coming. It will benefit many of those who have had to borrow in order to keep their

175th Legislative Day

11/2/2007

funding for schools going. I believe this will help people who need assistance from becoming homeless. And I believe that this implementation will help those in the State of Illinois realize that many of us here are working on their behalf. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "The Lady from DuPage, Representative Bellock, for what reason do you rise?"

Bellock: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Turner: "Indicates he will."

Bellock: "Thank you. I'd like to ask if... Representative, if you're going to continue to work with us on the money for the rural health care that was so important that we had put, that a lot of us felt was a top priority to put in the budget, and then the Governor vetoed that money. It was only seven hundred and fifty thousand dollars (\$750,000), but it was extremely important to support rural health care in the development of doctors and health professionals for all of Illinois in underserved areas besides rural health care. And I want to know if you're going to make a commitment to work on that if we do have another appropriation Bill, because seven hundred and thousand dollars (\$750,000) was so small, but it was a top priority that we worked on all year as a result of the Rural Healthcare and Underserved Area Task Force."

Hannig: "Representative, when your side of the aisle and my side of the aisle and the other chamber made an agreement to pass the budget last year..."

Bellock: "Right."

175th Legislative Day

11/2/2007

Hannig: "It was our intention that not only would we include these monies, but that we would all work together in case of an override. And I think it's fair to say that, since we're past the override time, that we should all continue to work together to restore all those monies that we had agreed to earlier in the year. And so, yes, I would work with you, not just on this one, but on any number of items that have been reduced."

Bellock: "Thank you, I appreciate that."

Speaker Turner: "The Gentleman from Vermilion, Representative Black, you spoke once."

Black: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, an inquiry of the Chair."

Speaker Turner: "State your inquiry."

Black: "Yes. Could someone check Representative May's desk? I saw her doing a filet of sole over there, and I just want to make sure that this desk wasn't damaged in any way. I mean, I have pounded it before with my little, chubby hands, but never my shoe, particularly the new desk. Is... has chief of staff, Mapes, gone back to check? Is there any damage on that desk?"

Speaker Turner: "We'll have the doorman... He's in the back..."

Black: "She'll be responsible."

Speaker Turner: "He's in the back of the room now. I think he's taking a look."

Black: "Well, all right."

Speaker Turner: "But I believe she said that shoe had a rubber sole or something. Representative May."

May: "Yes. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And..."

175th Legislative Day

11/2/2007

- Black: "I've never used my high heel like that, I'll tell you that."
- May: "Well, you know, it may have looked like an unplanned outburst, but I've learned from you, Representative. This is a rubber-soled shoe..."
- Black: "That looks like my shoe, where'd you get it?"
- May: "And it doesn't have a heel... I mean, it doesn't have a heel, it's a wedge, so it was very carefully placed on this beautiful restoration to not do any damage and I've checked it myself. Thank you so much. I really care about historic preservation..."
- Black: "As well you should."
- May: "...and watching this, but I want you to know it's rubber soled and it doesn't have a heel. Thank you for pointing that out."
 - Black: "Well, if you care about historic preservation, you should be nicer to me. I would like... I'm going to come over and look at that shoe because my wedgies were gone from my apartment. And I like it to. Is it an open toe? Is it an open toe?"
- May: "No, it's not, it's closed toe. I think we're going to be here when the snow falls, which adds to my frustration about not having a transit Bill because we're going to be here in the snow."
- Black: "Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, with your permission, I'm going to go over and check. I think those are my shoes."
- Speaker Turner: "Permission's granted. And with that,
 Representative... The Lady from Cook, Representative
 Mulligan, for what reason do you rise?"

175th Legislative Day

11/2/2007

Mulligan: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Turner: "Indicates he will."

Mulligan: "Representative Hannig, you did not... there's nothing in here that, because it's a 'bimp' Bill not the actual budget Bill, that reinstates COLA for the DASA people or the safety net for mental health, I agree."

Hannig: "So, it's my understanding that those items are actually driven by the actual spending Bill."

Mulligan: "Right. And that the Governor took those out and they were never reinstated, even though the House voted to override that, the Senate did not. So, the DASA workers, who haven't had a COLA for any, what is 6 years, I think."

Hannig: "Right. And this Bill cannot restore their COLA."

Mulligan: "I understand that."

Hannig: "But we could do it through an additional appropriation, Representative."

Mulligan: "I think if one of the Representatives can, you know, beat her shoe on the table for mass transit, I can go to the budget. So, I'm hopeful that you will agree with me that at some point we have to revisit that, because that's a travesty. Ever since we went to fee for service, the mental health system has had a problem both in being funded and the way it operates, mainly because they don't have clients that are fixed, they have clients that come and go. And so it's harder for them to fund. The DASA workers have had no additional money. We're talking about gaming, things that would cause problems with addictions, that's their area, we've never really funded any... a really good program for problem and compulsive gambling. The way this

175th Legislative Day

11/2/2007

budget was put together and the disjointedness of passing a budget, passing 'bimp' Bills later, redoing it, makes for what I would think, to be a nightmare come February and March over how much money we actually have, what's going to happen with the budget, how the bills are paid out of different funds. In the 15 years I've been here, and I'm sure you've been here longer than I have doing this process, this is kind of an embarrassment about how to do a And I would hope that we would continue in the House to work out a better system for the coming year. mean, I've had questions that I've repeatedly asked. happens if we don't do this? Can we pick it up in the FY09 budget? Things that have been left on the ground. really think that what we've done is we've created a problem for the coming year. We haven't addressed the hospital supplemental. I mean there are a lot of things hanging out there even though we do a quote, 'bimp' Bill, that picks up some of the problems and some of the things that implement a budget. The way we did a budget and then to follow it up with this kind of implementation is not something I'd like to see reoccur for the FY09 budget. I think what we need to do when we reconvene, particularly in January, is have the agencies come before us and start explaining to us where they stand on the current year budget and what's going to happen for the FY09 budget before we start hearing the Governor's message, because quite frankly, this is a messed up process that we're going to have a lot of trouble with for the rest of this year and it's certainly going to be an impact on how we do the FY09

175th Legislative Day

11/2/2007

budget. And I would not like to see this happen again. It was totally... a bad process, I'm trying to think of a word I can use on the microphone. And I would like to see some of the problems that were created in this budget straightened out in FY09 and I would like cooperation from the state agencies in allowing our staffs and the people that work with us, to find out what those problems actually are. And I think we need help from the Comptroller's Office, but I think we need a comprehensive review of what's actually happened in this budget, what we're doing and what we're not doing, and how we're going to rectify it in FY09. And I'd certainly like your pledge in helping with that, because you certainly carry a lot of weight here as far as what happens with this budget process in the House."

Hannig: "Representative, I can't speak for the Governor's agencies, but we certainly would say that your suggestion to come back in January and try to find out from those agencies where they are is an excellent idea and we should implement it."

Mulligan: "It always has seemed strange to me when we're scrounging around for five hundred thousand (500,000) for this or one million (1,000,000) for this, when you suddenly can come up with twenty-seven million (27,000,000) to bail this out or thirty million (30,000,000) to bail that out, when we couldn't find a way to accurately fund what's really important the first time around. And it seems to me that obviously we have not been told the truth about what some agencies have and where some money is or they would not be able to come up with this money from nowhere to fund

175th Legislative Day

11/2/2007

things that are important to only special people or certain people. So, I think that the people that we represent, particularly people that need COLAs or need to function, need to have a little better representation next time around."

Hannig: "Okay."

Speaker Turner: "The Gentleman from Montgomery, Representative Hannig to close."

Hannig: "Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. I think that the school districts that we represent have waited long enough for the four hundred dollar (\$400) increase in the per pupil allowance. I think that the... that the hospitals and nursing homes need to have this finalized. The time has come. We need to pass this Bill. It's November and we need to pass this Bill. So, I would simply ask for your 'yes' vote."

Speaker Turner: "So the question is, 'Shall the House pass Senate Bill 783?' All those in favor should vote 'aye'; all those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is now open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Coladipietro? The Clerk shall take the record. On this question, there are 111 voting 'aye', 0 'noes', 1 'present'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Dunkin, for what reason do you rise?"

Dunkin: "Point of information. Mr. Chair, I just wanted to inquire. Since the last Bill that went through had my name

175th Legislative Day

11/2/2007

on it, if you wanted me to speak, or introduce it, or say anything?"

Speaker Turner: "I think because it got 'no' votes... I mean it got all 'yes' votes, I think we did the right thing."

Dunkin: "So I should do all my Bills like that. Don't say any thing. Let it ride?"

Speaker Turner: "Let it ride."

Dunkin: "Thanks for the clarification, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Turner: "The Lady from Cook, Representative Hamos, for what reason do you rise?"

Hamos: "Thank you. Ladies and Gentlemen, I thought I would give an update on what is our looming transit crisis in the RTA region. I think we have all received now a letter from the Governor addressed to us, telling us that he has authorized a direct grant to the CTA and PACE, really to the RTA, for twenty-seven million (27,000,000) that they would need to maintain operations. Now, this is funding. It's still a little bit up in the air right now because this is funding that meets the approval of the Federal Transit Authority, the FTA. So, that's... we're still waiting for final word. I think that the RTA has taken a firm position that they would not accept funding that was a loan and had to be repaid. This seems to be different than This seems to be new money that would be made available to the system for the short term. But I think it is also important to note. So, I think that there will be a decision made today whether to accept this money but it does seem to fit within the parameters of what the RTA has said would help maintain the system. Now, I think it's

175th Legislative Day

11/2/2007

also important to note that there seems to be a general agreement that we will return within seven (7) to ten (10) days, if not sooner. But within seven (7) to ten (10) days to give an opportunity for the five (5) Leaders to work together, to work out a capitol Bill that would be offered as a compliment to the transit Bill and we would be able to vote on them together. That is certainly my hope. I think it's the hope of many people on this House Floor. And that we are urging the Leaders to do that. And if that all works then we will be able to stave off the service cuts and the fare increases and the six hundred (600) layoffs that now have been scheduled for this weekend. So, that is the update that I know people were asking for. That's all we know today."

Speaker Turner: "Gentleman from Cook, Representative Dunkin, again?"

Dunkin: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm happy to know that the Governor came through with some money at the final moment. The people in our district, certainly in mine, could care less where it comes from, how it gets there, as long as the service is continued throughout the City of Chicago and obviously, in other places within that region. They are expecting us to deliver some things down here before we get back to our respective areas. And what's important is we make sure that the casino or gaming is completely separate from a long-term fix as relates to public transit. We need to make sure that all of us are clear that mass transit has a positive impact on the entire State of Illinois. When one portion of the state does well, all of the state does

175th Legislative Day

11/2/2007

well. I would hate for us to leave here, even today or tomorrow or Sunday, without us coming up with some measure that is positive for a major portion of our state that happens to be where Chicago is. And most of... 75 percent of the state's population, but to leave here and not have something solid, something that's affirmed coming out of this Body, whether you're Republican or Democrat, whether you live up north or downstate or on the west end of the state or the east end of the state, it's critical that we take real adult and intelligent political stances that impact us in the best way that have our citizens' confidence restored in us. So, again, my call to our Speaker, to our Leaders, the Governor, the President, Minority Leaders, cetera, is to see to it before we leave here this weekend that something positive comes out of this chamber right here, the chamber over there, the Senate, that we sign a Bill that's going to not put us in the situation in another 5 and 10 years from now. the purpose of most us coming back down here. That's what's critical here in the State of Illinois. And I think we need to act on it like yesterday. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "The Gentleman from Vermilion, Representative Black, for what reason do you rise?"

Black: "Thank you. Point of personal privilege, Mr. Speaker, if I might. In all due respect to the previous speaker, I don't think that 75 percent of the people live in the Chicago metropolitan area. I might grant you 33 or 35 percent might live in the Chicago metro area. But I don't think it's 75 percent. I don't think nine million

175th Legislative Day

11/2/2007

(9,000,000) people live in Cook, Chicago, and the collar counties. The question that I have, Mr. Speaker, I don't know who to direct it to and I don't know if I can get an answer, where does the Governor keep coming up with this pile of money? Twenty million (20,000,000) here, twentyfive million (25,000,000) there, to give the CTA and RTA and METRA, a little cash to keep everything running. Where does he come up with this money? And who authorized the expenditure of said money? I didn't. I thought the Constitution said that part of my duty as an elected Member of the Illinois General Assembly, is that I have to approve or at least vote on said expenditures. Now, if my math is right, in the last month the Governor has found, found about forty-five million dollars (\$45,000,000). Where did he find it? And if he can find forty-five million dollars (45,000,000) for a temporary operating subsidy, which by the way certain publication today said they haven't even accessed all the money they were given five (5) or six (6) weeks ago, surely he could come up with two-hundred thousand dollars (\$200,000) to install a boiler, so that the cadets at Lincoln's Challenge would be assured of heat and hot water through the winter. That just begs the question, where does he find this money and who authorizes the expenditure of this money? Do you have any idea in your wealth of experience here?"

Speaker Turner: "Representative, I have an old metal detector that I keep in the car. And, you know, I try to keep fresh batteries in it and I haven't picked up a coin. I'm not certain where this twenty-seven million (27,000,000)... but I

175th Legislative Day

11/2/2007

guess it is greenback or paper money and that's probably been my difficulty in finding it. But I'm not clear where it came from. I know this, the transit riders in the City of Chicago and the collar counties, they're pretty happy the fact that it's there. But yeah..."

"Well, I would hope the Speaker... I can understand that. not standing here saying they don't need transportation system, they do. And as a downstater I understand that. But perhaps when we come back the Office of the Speaker could enlighten us on, number one, how do they get in this mess? What happened? How did they get in this mess? And number 2, where do you just find forty, forty-five million dollars (40,000,000; 45,000,000) in the state budget and say to any agency here, here take it and go away and be guiet for three (3) to four (4) weeks. Ijust... that's a budgeting factor that I've just never been able to figure out. More power to this Governor, but Governor, if you're out looking and you got a secret stash, Lincoln's Challenge could certainly use two hundred thousand (200,000) of that money for a new boiler, just to keep cadets from freezing to death."

Speaker Turner: "The Gentleman from Peoria, Representative Leitch, for what reason do you rise?"

Leitch: "An inquiry, as well, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Turner: "State your inquiry."

Leitch: "What is the answer to the previous Gentleman's question? Where is the... what is the source of the funding?"

175th Legislative Day

11/2/2007

- Speaker Turner: "I think you may want to ask that question to the guy on the second floor."
- Leitch: "No, I'm not interested in that. I mean this is before the House. Where... what is the source of the money?"
- Speaker Turner: "The Lady from Cook, Representative Hamos.
 Would you care to share some wisdom with the previous... with
 the questioner?"
- Hamos: "Well, we have... I don't know that we've seen a formal proposal from the Governor's Office. But we have been led to believe that it is money that's designated for transit in the Series B bond program. So, it's transit money that's sitting in a fund. It is available. It is left-over bond money. And that's why there's a little bit of a technical question about how it could be used for operations at the RTA level."
- Leitch: "When do you expect the technical questions to be resolved?"
- Hamos: "Well, that's what people are asking, and I think we're waiting momentarily. I personally wish the Governor might have checked with them first. That would have been better but we're waiting momentarily because I think this whole doomsday scenario depends on this one critical fact."

Leitch: "Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Gentleman from Winnebago, Representative Winters, for what reason do you rise?"

Winters: "Question of the previous speaker on the..."

Speaker Turner: "She'll try... she'll try."

175th Legislative Day

11/2/2007

- Winters: "I want to... I just want to hear that word again. Did you say bond money would be used for operations of the CTA?

 We're borrowing money to use in operating?"
- Hamos: "Yeah. I believe... again, we haven't seen the full proposal, but I believe these are bonds that have been issued and they're sitting in the fund and had not been expended. The Governor has the... apparently the legal authority to expend those monies, but they are sitting in that fund."
- Winters: "But if they're bond monies they should be expended on permanent... you know either infrastructure or rolling stock. Is that what it's being spent for? Is it going to be spent on salaries, on fuel, you know all the operating expenses of the CTA?"
- Hamos: "Well, there... there's going to be somewhat of a... you know, I'm not going to get into the technical details, because truthfully, I'm not qualified to. The RTA will have some authority... has some authority to take some bond money and use some of it for operations. The big problem we've had in this system, Ladies and Gentlemen, is that because we have failed to fund this system adequately for the past 3 or 4 years, we have forced them to take exactly these kinds of federal bonds, maintenance capital dollars and use them for operations. This is something that our Mass Transit Committee has been looking at. It is not good public policy. It is not good practice. They been basically raiding the maintenance capital program just to meet their salaries and just to keep the system going.

175th Legislative Day

11/2/2007

That's right. And we have forced them to do that by not providing for a long-term funding solution."

Winters: "Well, the question is whether we have force them to do it or whether they've made choices in not raising fares. The fare box returns is not even close to 50 percent. I understand the proposal that we were asked to vote on last month would have removed that requirement for the next (10) years. We have to say that there are responsibilities of those who use the systems to help maintain and pay for the system, that the RTA and CTA boards have not had the courage to implement a fare box recovery where the actual users pay for 50 percent of the cost should be one of their highest priorities. And they have to have the fortitude to make those kind of tough decisions. It's not totally the fact that we have underfunded the system, they have helped underfund it themselves."

Hamos: "Well, and I do want to correct the misimpression that's being left here, that they are not meeting their required fare box recovery. We set this into law in 1983. And by all accounts that was a really important law. I mean... that was an important part of that 1983 law. And we're not going to change that even with a new proposal. They are meeting their 50 percent fare box recovery. They're required to, in fact it's over 50 percent for the CTA portion of the three (3) agencies. The one (1) agency that gets a pass and... the overall average between Metra, CTA, and PACE is 50 percent. The only agency that comes in below that is PACE because they are serving some of the underserved areas in the rural areas. They're meeting that

175th Legislative Day

11/2/2007

fare box recovery, Representative Winters. And even under my Bill, they would be required to, although we allow them to phase it in, because if we were adding a whole bunch of money to the system they'd have to increase fares all of a sudden. We said it should be more gradual."

Winters: "The other... I would point out that the other element that the boards of those transit authorities have not done, And that is the reform. Looking at the pensions, I think there are some helpful steps to get started on pension reform, but the management of those agencies we feel many of the Legislators looking in from outside the Chicago area look at the way those agencies are run and suggest that there are many more management reforms that could be utilized that would put them back in a sound financial basis, rather than simply asking for more money. You've got to reform the way you operate, lower the needs for funds is another element that has been underemphasized. And I thank you for the privilege, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Turner: "The Gentleman from Bond, Representative Stephens, for what reason do you rise?"

Stephens: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, to respond to the Lady's comment, with your permission."

Speaker Turner: "Respond."

Stephens: "I would caution you to not characterize who 'we' are. When you say 'we failed' to do something. Well, who are the 'we' that lead the state? Who is the 'we' that is in charge of this Body? Who is the 'we' that is in charge in the Senate? And who are the 'we' that control every state office? Well, the 'we' that has failed are the

175th Legislative Day

11/2/2007

Democrats. The 'we' that has failed to lead this state for the last 5 years is the second floor in the Governor's Office. So, please, when you're... when you're blaming the process, you might want to leave some of us out. I tell the people in my part of the state, you know, the last thing we need is another Democrat in Springfield. Please, we've got enough problems, don't send us anymore Democrats. And as we finish our filing this week, those of us that want to run for reelection and those who are considering running for open seats, and those who will consider casting their vote in the February primary, please, no more Democrats. The people of Illinois can't afford it."

Speaker Turner: "Oui, oui. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Miller, for what reason do you rise?"

Miller: "Inquiry from the... of the Chair."

Speaker Turner: "State your inquiry."

Miller: "What's going on right now? I'm sort of confused. I mean... I know we've got... everyone knows the pending crisis of mass transit. We've had a lot of talks about it. We've been very engaged in it. We've had a hearing yesterday. We had caucus about it. And so, I just want to know like what are we doing now. There has been conversation that we'll be back on Monday, at least a week or so ago. Some of us have to plan things, some of us may not. I don't know. But you know, it just seem like folks are started to make speeches which are okay, but we just sort of need a sense of direction on where we're going."

Speaker Turner: "Representative, you know that the primary season is moving fast upon us. So, we thought we'd allow a

175th Legislative Day

11/2/2007

time for a little auditioning and give people the ability to practice. You know, between now and February 5. And so, that's what this moment or two is all about."

Miller: "Are we waiting for... I didn't get the memo. I didn't see the memo from the Governor. Are we waiting for that? Or are we just sort at a lull right now? Should we... I mean... what should we be sort of... should I make a speech on 750 and education funding and inadequacies of it? I didn't think anyone... you know, so, what are we... where are we?"

Speaker Turner: "You have a few minutes, Representative. As I said the primary is February 5. If you want to try your luck, go ahead. Somebody may be listening."

Miller: "I'll reserve that offer for later. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Gentleman from McLean, Representative Brady, for what reason do you rise?"

Brady: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I'd just like to make an announcement that once we adjourn, whenever that may be, the House Republicans will have a short caucus in Room 118. When we adjourn, whenever that may be, a Republican Caucus in Room 118. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: Gentleman from Cook, Representative Fritchey."

Fritchey: "Thank you, Speaker. How are you doing?"

Speaker Turner: "Very well."

Fritchey: "Inquiry for you, if you would. While we work out longer term solutions, in the shorter term, for those of us that may be getting a little hungry, would we be well advised to order lunch or do we think we'll be gone before food would be here?"

175th Legislative Day

11/2/2007

- Speaker Turner: "Well, you won't be able to eat at on the floor here. So, that choice is yours."
- Fritchey: "Mr. Speaker, these days I'll go eat at most anywhere right now. All kidding aside, I mean, are we planning on sitting around doing nothing for minutes or hours?"
- Speaker Turner: "I look at my watch by minutes. I would advise you to kind of do the same here."
- Fritchey: "As always, your wisdom is well received. Thank you."
- Speaker Turner: "The Gentleman from Cook, Speaker Madigan."
- "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this will be in the nature of a status report. I believe all of you received a copy of this letter from the Governor, where he stated that he planned to authorize twenty-seven million dollars (\$27,000,000) to the RTA. This letter was issued in the morning and there's been a delay because there was a problem with getting approval from the appropriate federal authorities to use federal capital money for operating purposes at the RTA. This is done in the ordinary course, but it does require federal approval. There were preliminary indications that the federal authorities would not authorize this use of money but within the last 10 to 15 minutes, I've been advised by Jim Riley with the RTA that he's gotten approval to convert the twenty-seven million dollars (\$27,000,000) dollars from federal capital to RTA operating money. Therefore, the plan is that we will adjourn today. Mr. Cross and I have met already today regarding a gaming Bill for capital. We plan to meet quite frequently. We haven't set the dates,

175th Legislative Day

11/2/2007

but we will meet on a... trying to think of the right word... we're going to meet quite frequently to try and get the job done. I didn't go to the best schools, you know that. So, that's the plan and Mr. Cross and I are on a 7 to 10 day timeline. That's the schedule that we're on. So, Mr. Speaker, there may be questions."

- Speaker Turner: "Gentleman from Crawford, Representative Eddy, for what reason do you rise?"
- Eddy: "Mr. Speaker, that timeline, the 7 to 10 days... last week or the last time we were here we were given the word that there would be a particular amount of notice. Can you make any guarantees of notice? And I'm not saying similar notice or exact or anything at all that we can plan by?"
- Madigan: "Not a guarantee. I would state that it would presume a policy of seven-day notice. That's what we talked about last time. And I think we ought to proceed on a policy there ought to be a seven-day notice. It may develop that we want to call you back in 6 days or 5 days. But we're not interested in calling you back on 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 days' notice. We're not interested in that. We're not trying to disrupt your lives. Okay. Our lives are being disrupted, also."
- Eddy: "Could we assume that the notice we received that mentioned Monday, this coming Monday, as a possibility is now..."

Madigan: "Canceled."

Eddy: "Canceled and that at least for Monday we wouldn't... but it could be after that. It could be sooner than 7 but certainly not Monday at this point."

175th Legislative Day

11/2/2007

Madigan: "Correct."

Eddy: "Thank you."

Speaker Tuner: "The Gentleman from Vermilion, Representative Black, for what reason do you rise?"

Black: "Well, I'm just fascinated by all this. If the Gentleman would answer a few questions or avoid answering them, I don't care. I'll take either one."

Speaker Turner: "He indicates he will."

"Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the fact that you and Leader Cross are not trying to disrupt my life. But up to this point you're doing a fairly good imitation of that. I leave November 8 for a week's visit with my father in I will not Arizona. come back under My father is circumstances until the 14 of November. eighty-nine (89) and I cherish every minute I can spend with him. So, the 7 to 10 days will not meet my schedule. But I don't expect either one of you to run this chamber around my schedule. But I'm sure I'm not going to be alone in the way we're doing things. But there are no surprises after this year. And I certainly don't hold you responsible for the Session without end. But let me ask you a question, because I am just fascinated by all of this bond issues that... most of us who took Samuelson's Economics 101 and 102 learned a long time ago, that the use of bond money is generally very difficult. I think as you know, for operation... to use as operational expenses. Representative Poe and I were talking earlier, I don't think the banker would grant you mortgage and then you send him a post card from Florida that you spent your mortgage

175th Legislative Day

11/2/2007

on a wonderful vacation. He would find it rather hard to put a lien on your vacation. Now of the twenty-eight million (28,000,000) or... excuse me, it might have been twenty-four (24,000,000) that you referenced from RTA, is this money that was given directly to RTA by a federal entity or is it state bond proceed?"

"Mr. Black, it does get a little convoluted and I left Madigan: out one part. The Governor will transfer twenty-seven million dollars (\$27,000,000) of Series B Bond money. There's sufficient money in the account. This was one of the appropriation items that were included in the Bill that the Legislature passed and the Governor signed. Once that money arrives at the RTA, the proposal is that it in effect offset the use of federal capital money, which those carriers are able to do with the concurrence of the appropriate federal agency. So again, state money flows from the State of Illinois to the RTA state money. The RTA uses federal capital money for operating purposes, which they have been doing in the last few years. Certainly the CTA has and one of the other carriers, either PACE or Metra have been doing this. They don't like it. They'd rather use that money to buy new buses, new cars, repair rails, but that's what's been happening for... I believe, 2 or 3 years."

Black: "Then the state bond money would replace the federal bond money that they intend to use?"

Madigan: "That's the idea. That's the idea."

Black: "But no new equipment will be purchased, I assume.

Because you're... if... as you and I know, if you and I start

175th Legislative Day

11/2/2007

spending our capital, that we've set aside for retirement, we're going to be in trouble. I assume from what in the Chicago newspapers' it would seem that mass transit in the Chicagoland area might be assumed to be in trouble. Operationally and capital, correct?"

Madigan: "I think so."

Black: "The money from the Series B Bonds that you're transferring, is this money that could have been accessed by mass transit districts statewide, i.e. the purchase of a Paratransit vehicle or a small senior citizen agency in my district, or a bus for the mass transit district in Champaign-Urbana, or was it money dedicated solely for the mass transit in the Chicagoland area?"

Madigan: "I don't have the exact answer for you. I presume that it was a general grant of authority and I presume it could be used statewide."

Black: "That's what I was afraid you were going to say. Well, I won't go any further. I don't need to get myself in any more trouble than I usually am in. When we do come back and if I'm here at that particular time, or perhaps your staff... I would welcome an opportunity to read a concise document as to how the mass transit agencies in Chicago got into this situation. It was said earlier that 'we' didn't fund them. And I thought Representative Stephens had a very good reply to the 'we' part. But it just appears to me that there has not been the degree of accountability that you often has insisted that we try to do in the appropriations process and that now, I don't know how many doomsday scenarios we've met and passed, but it... I'd be as

175th Legislative Day

11/2/2007

a downstater and I certainly... if it's a fair package we'll vote for mass transit for Chicago. It's vital, and needed, and necessary, depending upon how the Bill reads and some of the safequards that we have. But it would be nice to be able to tell my constituents what happened here. It's very easy and your friend and mine, the late Zeke Giorgi, often cautioned downstaters about bashing Chicago, you could make a out of it. But what at the end of your career, what good does it do? And a healthy Chicago is good for the entire State of Illinois. And I've tried to subscribe to But the perception to many of my constituents is that because of waste, and that may be too strong a word, lack of management oversight and control that the mass transit agencies in Chicago found themselves in a serious budget deficit. And again, many of my constituents have the perception that they are being asked to bail out this problem, which I think most of my constituents would say we didn't create. Now, I like your plan. But I don't know if that'll be the plan that we eventually get to vote on or not. But if we had a document where we could try and explain this to Kiwanis Clubs, Rotary Clubs, people that ask us to speak to them, because we're asked questions that I really don't have the information to answer. What caused this? Why did it get this serious? Why was it allowed to into in excess of a hundred million (100,000,000)? What happened? What assurances do we have or will we have that it won't happen 2 years from now or 3 years from now? And perhaps your staff can help us expound to various government groups and civic organizations as to

175th Legislative Day

11/2/2007

why we are in this situation and what we are looking to do to get out of this situation."

Madigan: "Mr. Black, I would suggest a good place to begin regarding the cause would be the audit issued by the Auditor General, Mr. Holland. It was used by Representative Hamos in the preparation of her Bill is a blueprint for changes in operations that she felt were necessary predicated upon the report of the Auditor General."

Black: "I appreciate that and I will have my legislative aide order that up this afternoon. I wish you and Leader Cross the very best as you wrestle with a very complex and complicated problem that often gets twisted and torn apart by regional differences. And the Capital Bill which is extremely important I think to the entire State of Illinois is another issue that will be difficult but not impossible for us to get done. And I again my renew my call and my plea there are some needs that have popped up. Lincoln's Challenge, a very excellent program, for the lack of twohundred thousand dollars (\$200,000) to replace a boiler, could be faced with a potential shutdown. You can't operate that facility without heat. So far it's being patched together and works sometimes and doesn't work others. But I assume that we will get guidelines from our caucus on certain capital concepts or ideas that we have that might be in that final product. But all I've ever seen is what the Senate has sent over. And I don't always agree with some of the Senate priorities. Will we have an opportunity as a chamber to look at what's in there? If

175th Legislative Day

11/2/2007

not line by line, it certainly general category by general category and say I think this road's the highest priority in my area than this road, et cetra, et cetra, et cetra?"

Madigan: "That's how I think it should be done."

Black: "I agree with you. Okay. So, if I don't get my way can I come over and talk you?"

Madigan: "I think you'll do it real well."

Black: "Oh, thank you very much."

Speaker Turner: "The Gentleman from Kendall, Leader Cross."

"Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Just for purposes of our caucus because we're not going to go to caucus. Friday afternoon. And people want to get out of here. would... and rightly so. Just a couple of observations and points. I... obviously there'll be questions about the twenty-seven million (27,000,000) and the way it's done, but I think in the interest in preventing a shutdown in the CTA, or PACE, or Metra is the last thing anybody wants. This may not be the best solution, but it's what is here and now available. And I support it in the interest of keeping the system running. And I want to acknowledge and a lot of people have worked on the mass transit issue. And Representative Hamos, of course, on your side, Mr. Speaker, has done a good job. But Representatives Mathias, Krause, Coulson, Mulligan, and Bassi have spent a lot of time on this and I know would have liked some resolution today. And it didn't happen for a variety of reasons. appreciate their passion and their dedication to this on behalf of our caucus. We also know that we need to do a Capital Bill. And my belief on this and approach is that

175th Legislative Day

11/2/2007

we need to send a Capital Bill over to the Senate that can pass. Not a Capital Bill for the sake of just sending over a Capital Bill. The Speaker and I have talked about some concepts and, of course, to all of us on our side we will get those out when they get firmed up with respect to the scope and size of the Capital Bill, we have a lot to discuss. As far as I'm concerned what came over from the Senate isn't what we're going to work off of. We will start over. The Speaker and I have talked about that with respect to the spending side. We, of course will get everybody's input from that. So, Mr. Speaker, thanks for your handling of this today and to all of those on our side, if we will… as we get further along in our discussion with the Speaker, we'll follow up with a conference call. So, thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Turner: "The Gentleman from Champaign, Representative Rose, for what reason do you rise?"

Rose: "Question of the Speaker, if I may? Mr. Speaker, I know this a difficult time to prognosticate, but do you have any idea when we might get a Calendar for the spring? Dr. Miller, I see behind you, has teeth to clean and cavities to fill. Roger Eddy has school board meetings to set. And I myself have a client case call that I have to set before court."

Madigan: "As soon as possible. As soon as possible."

Rose: "Okay. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Turner: "Seeing no further questions, Representative Granberg moves that the House stands adjourned 'til the

175th Legislative Day

11/2/2007

Perfunctory Session on Monday, November 5. All those in favor should say 'aye'; all those opposed say 'no'."

Clerk Mahoney: "The regular House Perfunctory Session will now come to order. Introduction and reading of House Bills-First Reading. House Bill 4164, offered by Representative Black, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. House Bill 4165, offered by Representative Mathias, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. House Bill 4166, offered by Representative Molaro, a Bill for an Act concerning animals. House Bill 4167, offered by Representative Bassi, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. And House Bill 4168, offered by Representative Molaro, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. Seeing no further business, the regular House Perfunctory Session adjourned 'til Monday, November 5, 2007."